

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,  
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

---

Vol. XIV

APRIL, 1927

No. 82

---

## EDITORIAL

By the time this number appears, the Lower Houses of the Convocations will have met to consider the Composite Book as amended by the Bishops, and we may then know the final form in which it will be brought before the Church Assembly. The stage of criticism through which it has been passing in the Convocations since its first publication in February has been of great importance, not only for the expressions of opinion which it has called out from divers quarters in the Press, but also because it has enabled its contents to be fully digested by the Provincial Synods before they take a final decision. It must be remembered that the question at issue is not simply the form which Revision shall take; so far as the great bulk of alterations and additions is concerned, the work done upon them during the last twenty years had left little room for anything very novel; in many cases, the new Book will do no more than give legal sanction to changes which have long been recognized both by authority and by public opinion. Behind this aspect of the Book, however, there is another which affects the clergy more personally. The Book is not only permissive, but in certain vital matters restrictive also; and on its restrictive side, at any rate, it is to bind the clergy *in foro conscientiae*, and if necessary to be enforced at law as thus binding; while, yet again, it will be this Book which will be the standard of reference in the terms of subscription required of all future candidates for the Ministry. It is significant, also, that the restrictive side of the Book is bound to bear with especial directness upon one section of the Church alone, and that a section which is producing a large proportion of candidates for the priesthood and is making itself responsible for their training. It is the consciousness of these facts, and not any failure to appreciate the solid progress registered in the new Book, which is causing the clergy, and particularly those who stand in the Catholic tradition, to walk



very warily. There are probably none who are not aware that any failure to carry Revision, through division among Church-people themselves, would inflict a grave blow on the moral prestige of the whole Church; and indeed this consideration will probably be strong enough to push it through the remaining stages. But that is all the more reason for endeavouring to ensure that in its final form it contains nothing which is likely to cause fresh irritation or confusion to English worshippers.

---

NOTE.

The following additional note to Father Waggett's article on the late Bishop of Zanzibar arrived too late to be inserted in the text. We think it too important, however, to omit, and therefore print it here:

A friend has pointed out to friends that the Bishop had no doctrine, no "message," about the Holy Spirit. This fact, and especially since the Bishop was unaware of his own silence, invites different interpretations, and it ought not to be left unnoticed here.

There are men to whom the advent of the Divine Spirit is an incident—almost an accident—of the new life. And there are other men not less sensitive to the Eternal, who, it may be, less often cry *Veni Creator* only because it has never dawned upon them that they have any avenue to Christ or to a place in His Body that is not the living stream of His own Spirit; or that anything small or great in the new order is done to the glory of the Father excepting by the Sovereignty of the Divine Spirit of Love.

Words and silence are equally eloquent in either case, and of the same truth. A Canon without an "Invocation" might imply the lunatic belief that the Holy Communion is not an instance of Divine Mercy, but an exploit within the compass of officers possessed through tradition of the "words of power."

But, on the other hand, such a Canon may be, and oftenest is, the fitting prayer for a priest who approaches the very vesting table "in the Spirit," makes his first obeisance *in exitu mentis*, and cannot conceive of gifts except as given, or make any place in his mind for a Church action that is not a work of the Spirit.

Moreover, the presence and utterance of an ἐπίκλησις may befit exactly the same all-embracing belief.

So it is of the name of the Spirit in the habitual language of a preacher.

If in a spiritual man's life there is little said of the Holy Ghost, this is because the Spirit makes in this man His characteristic utterance through mortal lips, that is, the Name of Jesus, for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.

---



"FRANK ZANZIBAR"\*

THIS Life, well built of good materials, is a book very easy to read, but very difficult to finish. It provokes excursions. For the subject belongs, in its own nature and reality, to a large setting. It is not, in fact, isolated, and cannot be studied as if it were. You cannot think of Weston and not of the past of the Universities' Mission; or forget Livingstone's adventures and his appeal that founded it; or his many predecessors and the old glimpses of savage Africa, like Battel's, who in 1590 lived many months in some warm spot, "the time being chiefly spent in continually triumphing, drinking, dancing, and eating men's flesh" with a tribe that "made war by enchantments and took the devil's counsel in all their exploits." African discovery, though lately it has moved so fast as to make even Stanley unintelligible, is really an old affair. It is hard to keep one's hands from *Mungo Park* and twenty other books.

And then, in contrast, if we follow Weston's life, how are we to avoid a satisfying discussion of personal piety and how it is bound to be Catholic in the long run; of faith in the Church and distrust of institutions; of Church unity and the ways, prudent or imprudent, of promoting reunion; or of magic and mental healing, of Christian separateness and the preservation of tribal customs, of civilization and the rights of nature?

Again, the advance of Missions in Africa is linked in fact and thought with the advance of missionary principles in England, so unexact in 1738, when Butler released the keen shaft of his irony in the sermon to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Natives, he pleaded, and the plea seemed necessary, were included in the scheme of salvation, "and if the nature of the case requires, that they may be treated [as slaves] with the utmost rigour, that humanity will at all permit, as they certainly are; and, for our advantage, made as miserable as they well can be in the present world; that surely heightens our obligation" not to forbid them a chance in the next. The state of mind that plea was addressed to seems remote to us. In the next generation Johnson found it monstrous, if not incredible. "To omit for a year, or for a day, the most efficacious method of advancing Christianity, in compliance with any purposes that terminate on this side the grave, is a crime of which I know not that the world has yet had an example" (Letter to Drummond, 1766).

\* *Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar. Life of Frank Weston, D.D., 1871-1924.* By H. Maynard Smith, D.D., Canon of Gloucester. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.



Dr. Maynard Smith has done with apparent ease a very difficult work. His wide knowledge and ardent curiosity enable him to weave all the many topics into a single whole—a monument of a scholar's exact resolution and a friend's devotion. How much we owe to the affection that sprang up in Oxford thirty years ago between the accomplished writer and his subject! It gives us a very Christian book—that is to say, a book at once spontaneous and exact, gay and profoundly serious, sympathetic and judicious.

We are shown a man singularly constant in dedication to God and to his neighbours. His life has a unity which other lives, not less impressive, at some one period fail to attain. He was "as good as bread," firm and satisfying; a man who at first might seem too cool, too shrewd, too humorous for a prophet, but who carried under the strong shield of a grave and cheerful bearing a heart perpetually on fire with love, and only not restless because the way of prayer and service—one way—was steadily followed. If the Bishop disregarded easy paths and climbed rugged ones without excitement and (in the *deepest* sense) without dismay, it was because he had really absorbed the truth of his faith, and knew that the power of Christ is developed in His Church, not essentially in the splendour of miracles, nor always in the eminence of spiritual gifts, but always in the courage or the patience of suffering. He looked to see the first fervours of consecration translated into the drudgery of obedience, and the Divine grace claiming every day more opportunities and more faculties for subjection to the healing of discipline. So he attained a constancy both calm and ardent. Even when he burnt his ships, it was with a sober incendiarism; and the unceasing labours, which ended only when death found him in harness on All Souls Day two years ago, disclosed more clearly every year a character both strong and engaging, generously impulsive and skilfully judicial; and a will which, because it was unhampered by selfish aims or permitted fears, was ready to follow a course once approved with a promptitude disconcerting to less detached men. A man ready to take all risks is worth large reinforcements against an opponent that desires ease. If we cannot measure the victories of this man, it is because, truly and quite simply, his battle was not with flesh and blood, but against the common enemy of all human progress. There was no discharge for him in that war; his stability was one of incessant strain. He seemed a pillar firmly fixed; he was, in fact, "shaken and consumed by the fires of his own zeal."

Both the strain and the strength came to him in the Mission and in the work of a Bishop. But he brought to a great dis-



cipline the earlier gifts of a sound temperament and a wise preparation.

Some servants of God are called to conquer or to manage what appear to us initial disadvantages of race and culture; or to repair early losses of moral strength, or the results of a feeble or a wasted education.

This man received a strong blood and a good home, and did not neglect the opportunities of school or college; and it was the school of the great man-maker Gilkes, and the college of Newman and Davidson and Gore. Stratford with Roxburgh, Westminster with Trevelyan, confirmed his strength without obscuring his vocation to Africa and the great Mission of the Universities.

The Universities' Mission to Central Africa had long been accustomed to use the highest gifts of faith and courage, of character and talents and scholarship. It had an immense influence upon Churchmen at home. It was the wedding of Catholic fervour with the romance of Evangelization. I am not sure that its fires were not hotter than any we knew of late till Weston came to us. It would be wrong to use a mere sketch of its history and manner as background for a figure even so shining as his. But *some* elements of its strength may fitly be recalled.

It was great not only in its line of Bishops and in its other leaders in Africa, but also in its champions at home, of whom two only shall be named as supreme, Westcott in Cambridge and Holland in Oxford and London; and to make this selection is to omit names not less than venerable. Through these men and their strong allies the Mission's call has remained clear and compelling in the Universities to this day. Who that ever saw it will forget a "Zanzibar" meeting under Holland? In no other work was Holland more gloriously himself, in the great music of his eloquence, in shining and communicated faith, in lucid advocacy, in the fire of devotion, in the light and charm of wisdom and humour, and in the incomparable happiness he diffused. (I have suppressed many memorable names, but I must recall Cyril Child, with a long pole in his hand and adoring eyes on the Chairman, ready to show a devoted audience where Chauncy Maples was newly settled or where a Padre had died.) No wonder England is sprinkled with men who aspired to the Mission and were sent back to the ranks by Bishop Smythies, lying, feet higher than his head, in Father Russell's Brooke Street rooms; for the conditions of health in Africa were not well understood then, the real chances of health were fewer, the casualties dreadfully frequent, and the lion-hearted Bishop, for all his contempt



of pain and danger in his own person, was shrewdly prudent in admitting recruits.

Weston found the Mission changed. Zanzibar was "Europeanized," and had clubs and balls and the doings of an English colony. The mainland, once mysterious and pathless, still demanded the most laborious travelling. But new dioceses were strongly established, and the territories engaged the attention of Great Powers and attracted great money. On the other hand, Islam, always strong in Zanzibar and Pemba, was now again advancing on the mainland. It is not always remembered how ancient is the superiority of this power in tropical Africa, that it made "Tomboctoo" in the thirteenth century, and Mombasa—Milton's Mombasa and Kenya's—in the eleventh.

The new Moslem Missions from the North were ill-equipped and ignorant of the system they represented. But they were always growing and always active; and their preachers were zealous and self-sacrificing. Here was a menace for which some minds were, by the magic of inattention, left unprepared. Holland had always spoken of its inevitable arrival; had always seen Mid-Africa as the arena of spiritual conflict between the Gospel and a paralyzing monotheism. Weston found the menace armed and growing. It changed, he urged, the place of the Mission in the battle-order of the Cross. Once, perhaps, it had been the pursuit in pity of a vanishing race, the succour of a society in retreat. Now, certainly, it was part of the front line. Here if anywhere must the Church push to the utmost her effort to occupy human life for God in Christ. He was convinced by experience that Islam could not keep pace with human advance. It was masterful only by retarding it. It could not lead men to Christ; and the salvation in every sense of the nations of Africa required the immediate and unrelenting provision of the Gospel. Were this refused or delayed—and in such a case delay is refusal—those nations must fall under a negative and sterilizing influence.

Mohammedanism and heathenism have quite different effects upon Africans, and the effect of paganism is practically the better of the two. For the pagan African is a child not unwilling to wake, but the Mohammedan African is already wide-awake in a limited world, buttressed and confident. He may not rise to the faith or virtues of his Arab teachers, but he wears an armour of religious superiority and has the protection of a strong society. One of the most pressing tasks of the Church is to make *our* brotherhood real and effective without making it one of profit or station.

By the Moslem revival the Mission was pressed more hardly than of old. In some other ways it was safer, less romantic,



more solid. It was soon to face the test of the War, and the subtler difficulties of a redistribution of territory.

In this world of Central Africa—for it is a world—Weston came to his own; grew to his appointed stature; found the secret of his life; and became a free man. This is not to say that he became able to do all he wished, but that his efforts sprang always more directly from a centre in himself, tapped the deep springs of his personality, employed his qualities and preparations, and had behind them the unhindered weight of his powers.

Freedom in the sense intended was real not in spite of subjection to God, but just because of a dependence, always more steadily conscious, upon the Master he knew by faith and had always desired to serve. The centre of his being became more masterful in control, but this centre was found to be not in himself, but in Christ. This is the very character of the believing life. The sovereignty of Christ is by gift of the Spirit the self-determination of the Christian.

Such a life of faith is not unusual; but in Weston it is displayed with unusual clearness. It was a power definite and compelling, a constant possession, not an equipment to be dispensed with or detached. It was every day and with practical results that he believed in the sovereignty of God, in the Divine Word as the present Lord of the Church and the active Shepherd of all men. He knew that the power of the Spirit is not, in the Divine purpose, only a part of our message, but the evidence that supports it now and will make it come true. Religion—who knew it better than this man of prayer?—is *nothing* if it is not personal, and there is a bond between each man and God which no other can share. But in this individual relation a corporate life is implicit. Without this the individual faith is not yet itself, for it lacks the generosity of Christ's own gift. "We love, because he first loved us." To decline the Church adventure is to be content with a maimed conversion; it is to take with both hands and yet refuse the return desired by the Giver.

So the Bishop believed the Church to be part of revelation, essential to the perfection of God's own address to us, entirely necessary for our response to God. It was no dispensable device for getting the Gospel preached, but Christ's "own Creation," sustained in being by the Word from moment to moment as, in their lower relation to Him, are the material universe and the real order of society. We could not remake the Church, nor go beyond the variations she comprised.

Set beside this Church devotion the "institution-sickness" he confessed to his biographer (p. 222). "The Church of England



and the Church of Rome do *not* represent the Christ truly. They are not revelations of His broken heart." And he longed to gain freedom by resigning his see. Probably all bishops wish at times to resign. But Weston's is not the cry of weariness with an accepted lot—*agricolam laudat juris legumque peritus*—nor evidence of an individualism repressed to make room for Churchly principles. No. The Bishop's profound dissatisfaction with the actual appearance and conduct of the Church is the other side of his profound belief in the Church as Christ's witness and organ, as the sphere of salvation into which he longs to welcome all, but whose standards for that very reason he must not confuse.

But if, on the one hand, he was rigid in conformity to Catholic standards, believing that no particular Church acting alone had the right to depart from them, on the other hand, he was determined to declare that no Catholic body could "contract out" from vital interest in whatever, upon any plane, really concerns the race of man. On the one hand, if anywhere among Christians the conditions of sacramental life were defective, we could not, out of zeal for a working unity, teach our neighbours that they might safely go without what they lacked. The gifts were to be dispensed, not dispensed with. On the other hand, if anywhere the development of a young state made the demand for labour ever so desperately urgent, it was *Church* doctrine that the labour must be free.

I am not concerned here to define a Christian socialism, a State-ism that believers can approve, but only to suggest the balance of the Bishop's mind, the real effect of his Catholicism. The Church existed within the current of Christ's redemptive mission, and therefore existed "for" the world. From this world the Church must save the peoples, in Christ's own power, by using every form of experience as occasion for sharing the sacrifice of the Son given to the world to this very end.

In lives like this we see in the Church not that failure to bear or to nurse which Newman exquisitely lamented in one of the famous passages of our prose, but her fertility and her power to use, tenderly or sternly, her sons of every kind. "There is no waste," said Illingworth, "in the great household where we serve." And this is true, not because men of a certain stamp achieve among us success even of the most apostolic and self-forgetful kind, but because they find even with us the road to a full measure of endurance. For, whatever despondency suggests, the work of Christ grows, both in extension and intensity, by the absorption of more men and more faculties and modes of life, both inward and



outward, in the work of "obedience unto death"; "the better fortitude of patience and heroic martyrdom."

Weston's faith was as balanced as any man's; but a special mood was emphatic in his theology. It was the mood that reverences the self-limiting purpose of the Divine love. This was true of his thought. The book suggests that it was true of his devotion also. All Christians worship the Eternal Word and offer prayer to Him. But some turn their desires towards the Word in His unchanging majesty, or to the Word creating and sustaining the material and the moral universe; or "striving" with man in history. I think that it was in the Word Incarnate, and in the Incarnate enshrined at the heart of His Church, that the Bishop found most constantly the answer to his soul's need. I am sure his prayer, which was very constant, was full and various as his life. But his *repose*, I conjecture, was in the "focussed," near-drawn grace of Nazareth, Bethlehem, Calvary, and Olivet. The vastness of the physical universe shocked rather than exalted him, and—to turn to quite a different mental region—he perhaps seldom attempted the adventures of abstract thought. If his reverent mind would have recoiled from Patmore's words about "the ghastly boundlessness of Space," he might have welcomed the Poet's more beautiful words:

"For, ah, who can express  
How full of bonds and simpleness  
Is God?  
How narrow is He,  
And how the wide, waste field of possibility  
Is only trod  
Straight to his homestead in the human heart?"\*

One sees in the book that from early days he had welcomed the order and definitions of the historic Church, even its firm boundaries, though he longed for all to be within its world of love.

"I was right joyful of the wall of stone  
That shut the flowers and trees up *with the sky*,  
And trebled all their beauty."†

This "focussing" of faith was related to the Bishop's pointed, spear-like loyalty to our Lord in the Sacrament; it accounts for his discontent with any Christian unity that should be merely metaphysical, or else mystical, a discontent expressed quite as really at Kikuyu as at Lambeth. To it belongs his fierce pity for the weaker races and persons of Africa, in whom he revered, in a definite and compelling way, images of God and companions of the flesh of Christ.

\* Coventry Patmore, "*Legem Tuam Dilexi*" in *The Unknown Eros*, a book with the motto *Deliciae meae esse cum filiis hominum*.

† Morris, *Defence of Guinevere*.



Any discussion of "Kikuyu" and of "Lambeth," if it is in the least real, opens the whole subject of Christian Reunion. We all agree about the end, but not about the means. And a discussion less than deliberate and resolute does more harm than good. It is better to forego it than to break it short. The history of those very important occasions is in the book; it is valuable now, and will grow in value as the light grows. Everyone who really cares for Reunion, and believes in it as a real hope to enlist our wills, should consider and reconsider the Bishop's speech in the Lambeth Conference, as it is made known to us here.

With respect to matters of difference, it should be remembered that Weston was an orator, one of the few orators of our moment. We had once been used to eloquence, and lately used to going without it; and it was with a shock that we again met an orator; that is to say, not merely a man who could control an abundance of beautiful or telling language for the purposes of clear and elevated thought, but one who could give himself to his hearers, and, by virtue of that very power, was sensitive to their sympathy and their antagonism.

This kind of power makes some men swift, as he was sometimes swift, to believe their cause of the moment lost. The eloquent clear-thinkers do not remember that the results of their own habitual meditation are new to their hearers, and that the process of conviction requires time, mere lapse of time, as if it were a kind of cooking of opinion. They think their plea has been rejected when the issue is not yet joined.

Occasionally, therefore, Weston was despondent about Church affairs. He really made an important contribution to Church ideas, a contribution recalling the contribution made long before by Bishop Gray and the South African Church. He brought to a point the always important effect in England of the Catholic Missions, and, apart altogether from this, will appear himself in years to come, like a Boniface returned home, one of the pivotal influences of English Church history.

He sometimes thought he had failed in Church efforts; but then he thought he was unsuccessful in affairs which, under protest, must be called secular; and about these it is easier to judge. When England accepted new responsibilities in Central Africa, it was of special advantage that a man of simple and direct judgment was familiar with the new ground. In the politics of war and peace men's minds and purposes are confused by many lights. There are prospects of immediate usefulness to England, and, not less, to the populations taken in hand. The development of latent resources is an inspiring idea. Short cuts appear, but they are dangerous. We know



their parallels in Church affairs. The longer wisdom especially needs its witnesses; and perhaps, when men look back upon our time, it will be seen that the Church was useful to the Empire not so much because it provided education, quinine, discipline, the encouragement of social order, and the other things for which governments give generous praise to missions, but because Church ministers sometimes could state more carefully than the burdened servants of the State the great principles of human liberty, the foundations upon which a State may safely repose. "He who walks in the dark will be guided more safely by one large and clear light, though distant, than by many smaller which sparkle on both sides of him."\*

Yet about the Labour Problems in the new Colonies he thought at first he had failed. The book says simply that the Bishop's interview with Lord Milner was unsuccessful.

The conversation—it was in Lord Milner's house in Great College Street—was not, I thought then and think still, really discouraging. The Bishop put his case very well, and the Minister appreciated the case. But Lord Milner was a man who carried under a reserved manner a heart ready to flame for persons or races under oppression, and was, besides, thoroughly accustomed to dispense with the recognition of his best intentions. What he said about the Labour Ordinances was this. "The Ordinances are all right and rightly drawn, and the safeguards of liberty are as complete as they can be made by any *document*. But if the actual working of the Ordinances permits or leads to the invasion of liberty, then there is a wrong that must be made to cease, and I wish to know more about what actually happens." It was as much as a Secretary of State could say without consulting his Department and without hearing the persons complained of. In point of fact, the Governors of the new territories were called home for council, and the sequel of their evidence and advice was a new Labour Ordinance by Mr. Winston Churchill with which the Bishop was satisfied.

It is true that these difficulties are not at an end, and the whole field needs the most careful watching; true also that Mr. Churchill belonged to the party opposed to Lord Milner's. But in this kind of politics there is a good deal of continuity, and it need not be doubted that the Bishop's informed zeal brought in an element that was vitally necessary, and contributed to a wise revision of the Ordinance and to a more exact control. There is now some beginning of representative government in Kenya, and that lets in light, though it does not by itself secure the rights of natives; and we have in Mr. Ormsby Gore a Minister who will not let light be wasted.

\* W. S. Landor in an unpublished Imaginary Conversation.



With our political care of weaker races, and with the preservation of their tribal organizations, the greatest interests are bound up, though they may be unperceived. Nevertheless, these matters of trade and government may conveniently be contrasted with belief, devotion, and virtue, the direct interests of religion and the Church.

With respect to these also—the constant and shining concerns of the Catholic Faith—the Bishop's influence will prove much stronger and more permanent than his humility was inclined to believe it; and it may be that generations to come in Africa, as in England, will bless the name of Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar, who lived in the remote and hardly understood twentieth century, in the nascent world-Communion of Canterbury, and just before the full dawn of Catholic reunion.

The margin of the page forces an abrupt farewell to these notes upon Dr. Maynard Smith's distinguished book. They leave unnoticed many important movements of the Bishop's thought and action, because they were movements, and presently found a new level in stability; and some great subjects because no useful discussion of them can be short, and they are duly discussed in the book. The notes must go; the book must be kept. The most vivid personal memory of Frank Weston finds here a revelation. We are allowed to learn much of the origin and the renewals of his beloved influence. Not all the secrets of his devotion—though these are wonderfully approached—but at least the actions and the great life of charity that were outside our view. When we could not follow him, he was unweariedly turning many to righteousness in the land of his apostolate; and when he made his all too rare visits, he uplifted, inspired, and guided us, as only a man of intense faith and burning love can.

His path grew brighter as he followed it. It was as the dawning day. Even now may we not, in our private thoughts, "with high praise and hearty thanks," count him, with Patteson and Smythies, among those who were "the choice vessels of God's grace and lights of the world in their several generations"?

P. N. WAGGETT, S.S.J.E.



## THE POSSIBILITIES OF PRAYER\*

THIS paper is called the "possibilities" of prayer because I want to consider not how prayer is done, or why it is done; but *what* it can do. That sounds somewhat vague, and to some extent it must remain vague; because here, as everywhere when we touch the region where human nature fringes on the supernatural, our general, cloudy, and yet most genuine knowledge so far exceeds the bounds of our exact science. It is not my intention to discuss startling or miraculous possibilities inherent in prayer, or any of the abnormal states described by the mystics: but simply and briefly to consider prayer in a somewhat wider way than we usually do. To think of our small emergent souls, face to face with the fact that, directly they attain genuine self-consciousness, they attain with this some craving, and at least a potential aptitude for contemplation of God and communion with God; with supernatural realities. "Thou hast made us for *Thyself*." It is amazing; and sometimes we forget how amazing it is and what it ought to mean in awe and delight. There you are, over against the mystery of the universe; and you find yourself drawn, perhaps vaguely, perhaps intensely, to this acknowledgment of, and this intercourse with, the supreme spiritual fact, so vividly and yet so imperfectly known by us, to which we give the name of God. Perhaps a small fragment, perhaps a large extent, of the supernatural landscape, and apprehension of this supernatural fact, is gradually revealed to you; perhaps none is revealed—you are, as it were, wrapped in fog—but still, even in obscurity, this ineradicable tendency or search for God goes on. Man is a contemplative animal, said St. Thomas. His life is not complete without prayer. We are pressed by the law inherent in all life to set up some correspondence with that living spiritual environment which we see, feel, or divine; and in so far as we are faithful in obedience to this profound instinct, so do various types and degrees of this correspondence disclose themselves as our spiritual life matures. For the life of prayer far exceeds, in its many levelled richness and variety, the variousness and colour of mental or physical life.

Perhaps we feel most strongly our dependence on the transcendent, and our needs; and our prayer is largely an asking. Perhaps we feel the completeness of our ignorance, over against the surrounding mystery. We want to know more; and our prayer is largely a seeking. Perhaps we feel love, and long to show love and come closer to the object of our love; and our position is that of those who knock at the door. But in all

\* Paper read before the Anglican Fellowship, July, 1926.



three cases one fact is concerned. They are all three ways in which the supernatural pull is felt by the soul: in which the human self recognizes its latent capacity for God. They are diverse recognitions of the essential but still unfulfilled relation existing between "man's nothing perfect and God's all-complete." All acknowledge the inexhaustible richness and generosity of the Infinite; the overplus, beyond anything which the limited, half-grown spirit of man has yet received or found, or to which his desires can attain. They represent the opening up of three kinds of unlimited opportunity before the soul; and induce in us a humble awareness of the infinite and unrealized possibilities inherent in prayer—possibilities which depend for their realization on the energy and purity of our desire, the wide-open, humble receptiveness of our souls. When our Lord uttered His three promises about prayer, were they not virtual criticisms of the poverty and thinness of man's spiritual desires, the hesitating character of his search, the lack of confidence in his habitual approach? Were they not a reminder of the enormous possibilities, unrealized yet, if only man will ask, seek, and knock on a loftier level of supernatural desire; and with a more vivid realization of the relation in which his childish and dependent spirit stands to its Eternal Source? St. Bonaventura, in a great and eloquent passage, divided all men of prayer into three types—those who ask and intercede, those who seek into the mysteries of God, and those devoted to loving adoration; the intercessory, the theological, and the mystical souls. He said that all three were needed together if all the rich possibilities of communion with God inherent in the Church were to be expressed; reminding us again of the wide stretches of that unvalled world to which man has access, when he stills his restless mind and turns towards God.

Now this humble, confident, and desirous relation of the soul to God, which is the foundation of all prayer, is, when we get to the bottom of it, a one-sided relation. All prayer, though it seems and must seem to us mainly to involve our act, our demands, our self-oblation, is ultimately and only referable to the action of God Himself. It is the result, as theology says, of the combined action of will and of grace; but only of the will that grace has first inspired and continues to support. So true is Augustine's great saying: "Thou art the love with which the heart loves Thee"; so true is Hilton's enlargement of it:

"He it is that desireth in thee and He it is that is desired. He is all, and He doth all, if thou might see Him. Thou dost nought, but sufferest Him work in thy soul and assentest to Him with great gladness of heart, that He vouchsafeth for to do so in thee. Thou art nought else but a reasonable instrument, wherein that He worketh."



When we see things like this, when we see the whole span of human prayer from its first naïve beginning in childish wants and dependence, to those Alpine peaks where the saints dwell alone with God, as a part of the supernatural action of God Himself, in and with His creation; then its possibilities begin to look very different. It is no longer a case of our little souls standing face to face with the supernatural landscape external to us, and trying to get into touch with it by their own efforts; but rather of an ever-greater opening up of those souls in various ways and degrees to that spiritual reality in which they are already bathed, and by which they are already sustained and transfused. So many people's prayer is like St. Augustine's description of going to the top of a little hill and *looking* at the Land of Peace: in entire forgetfulness that the one Master of prayer told us that this country of peace is within. And the capital possibility opened up to us in prayer—taking it now in its most general sense—is that we can find this to be literally true; and that our small derivative spirits, by such humble willed communion with the very Source of their being and power, *can* grow and expand into tools of the Divine Love and Redeeming Power. Within the atmosphere of prayer, but only within that atmosphere, they can expand from a narrow selfhood into personalities capable of being fully used by God on supernatural levels for supernatural work. That of course is holiness; and holiness, the achievement of a creative personality capable of furthering the Divine action within life, is, I take it, the true assigned end, the central possibility of the rightly ordered and faithfully followed individual life of prayer.

But all this is too big for us to grasp and deal with as a whole. Most of us are committed, at best, to that which the Abbé Huvelin used to call "a bit by bit spirituality." We have to look at the possibilities of our own small and fluctuating prayers in a more departmental and restricted way; though never in total forgetfulness of the great spiritual landscape into which they bring us—a landscape so rich and great that no one person can explore, apprehend, still less live in all of it. It is always good to remember that the spiritual life in its factualness, like our physical life in its factualness, is not merely what it seems to us to be: that the true nature and extent of those forces which condition us *must* be hidden—a drastic process of translation must take place, before supernatural value can be apprehended by human minds. This truth should surely keep us in humility as regards our tiny and limited religious apprehensions; and in delighted confidence, as regards the unmeasured possibilities opened up to us in prayer. It is at once bracing and humbling thus to remember the real facts about



the source of that mysterious sunshine of which we sometimes feel a little; that boundless generous air which we take as it were for granted, and almost unconsciously breathe. There surrounding, bathing and transfusing us, but in its reality infinitely transcending us, is that unmeasured world with its powers, its beneficent influences. Here are we, virtually capable of a certain communion with it: and that communion is Prayer. On its side the possibilities are unconditioned; for the action of God upon the soul is absolutely free. On our side, we are conditioned; limited by our half-animal status, by the imperfect freedom of our wills, by the peculiarities of a psychic apparatus adapted to the physical world.

Perhaps we can best think of our own actual possibilities—what we with our limited capacities can do in, through, and with our small measure of communion with God—under three heads. There are, first, all the possibilities of our outward-flowing prayer as towards God Himself. Secondly, its reflex and creative possibilities, in and as towards our own souls. Thirdly, its possibilities as towards the world and those in it. God, the soul, the world—the three realities of which we know anything. Within the possibilities of our prayer are an immense change and enhancement of our relationships as regards all these.

Not only are these three realities and relationships fundamental; but in the matter of prayer the order in which we regard them is fundamental too, if we are to realize all the supernatural possibilities inherent in the Christian life. And it is here, I think, that we often begin to go wrong. The simplest of all ways of regarding these possibilities is to consider that prayer truly embraces, first, all our possible access to and communion with the supernatural, with God; next, and because of that possible access, all our chances of ourselves becoming supernatural personalities useful to God; last, and because of *that*, all our capacity for exerting supernatural action on other souls.

It is obvious, directly we put it like this, that all three groups of possibility—all the three directions in which man can hope to deepen and enlarge his supernatural life—hang wholly and utterly upon our primary relationship with God. We, being at best half-animal creatures, with a psychic machine mainly adapted to maintaining our physical status, cannot conceive of that supernatural status and activity, much less achieve it by ourselves. Until grace has touched us we do not know what grace is: and unless grace supports us, we cannot go on knowing what grace is. Therefore attention to God, adoration of God, is the first and governing term of the life of prayer; the unique source of all its possibilities. In the deepening and development of our loving, non-utilitarian prayer towards God,



in and for Himself, the balance which is maintained in it of docility and of effort, lies for most of us our hope of achieving a genuine and lasting religious realism, the peace, joy, delightedness, of perfect certitude. Even to say this is at once to place before our minds a spiritual possibility to which only a fraction of practising Christians could probably venture to say they had attained.

In discussing the power of attentive and adoring prayer to bring the soul into a deeper and more concrete consciousness of God, the parallel between spiritual and æsthetic apprehension is often drawn; and though I cannot think this parallel to be adequate, it is worth remembering so long as its limitations are clearly recognized. Now anyone who has ever practised landscape painting knows the immense and unguessed transfiguration of the natural world which comes to the artist through patient, attentive, and unselfish regard; how the significance and emphasis of simple objects changes, how an undreamed beauty and reality is discovered in familiar things through that deliberate contemplation of his subject, that absorbed, unhurried, and largely unreflecting gaze in which effort and docility certainly do combine. That is the way to enter into communion with nature. It is also one great way of entering into communion with God: a path along which we may reasonably hope to discover the intense reality, the mystery, and the beauty of the world to which we turn in prayer, yet in which we live and move and have our being.

"If we would *taste* God," says Ruysbroeck, "and feel in ourselves Eternal Life above all things, we must go forth *into* God with a faith that is far above our reason, and there dwell . . . and in this emptiness of spirit we receive the Incomprehensible Light, which enfolds and penetrates us as air is penetrated by the light of the sun. And that light is nothing else but a fathomless gazing and seeing."

So we will put first among the possibilities that wait upon adoring prayer—that simple, quiet, yet ardent looking at and waiting upon God—a certain most real, if limited, knowledge of Him and of Eternal Life. This sort of prayer, persevered in, does bring us to a progressive discovery of the vivid reality and richness of those supernatural facts which the doctrines and practices of formal religion are designed to express. Theocentric prayer can lift those doctrines, symbols, and practices from the level of dreary unreality at which we too often leave them; and can make of them that which they ought to be, the transcendent art-work of the religious soul. It can inform the simplest, crudest hymn and the most solemn service with vitality, and cause each to convey spiritual truth: because the persons



using these forms of expression are accustomed to look through them towards God, in love and joy. For prayer of this type, developing as it does our spiritual sensitiveness, and releasing us from the petty falsities of a geocentric point of view, gradually discloses to us a whole new realm of reality and our own status within it: and with this a progressive sense, that the best we can ever know or experience is nothing in respect of that plenitude of being which God holds within His secret life. Thus this simple and adoring contemplation, which some have condemned as fostering illusion or spiritual pride, is as a matter of fact the best and gentlest of all teachers of humility. And far from leading the soul to despise "ordinary ways," it brings it to a deeper, meeker, more gentle, intimate discovery of God revealed through sacramental and incarnational means. It sets the scene of the supernatural life, and helps the little human self to get its values right, recognize its own lowliness; teaching it the utter distinction in kind between nature even at its highest, and supernature in its simplest manifestations, and bringing its little life of succession into touch with the Eternal Changelessness.

So far, then, as to the great enrichment and expansion in the life of adoration which is possible to theocentric prayer. Next, what are the possibilities of prayer as regards our own souls? What are we going to claim that it can do for the soul's life, which nothing else can do? What are its possible effects on human personality? What latent powers can it develop? The claim here is tremendous; and may be summed up in one word, sanctification. And when we think of what prayer really is, and of what an unfixed, emergent, half-made thing human personality is, this can hardly surprise us. Our small and childish spirits are here being invited and incited by God's prevenient Spirit to enter into communion with Him. If this communion of the half-real with the wholly real is done sincerely, humbly, simply and steadily, surely the result must at least be gradually to conform us to fresh standards, and endow us with fresh power. In these hours, we are breathing spiritual air, feeding on spiritual food, entering into awareness of spiritual things. By them our deepest selves are changed, stimulated, and nourished; and our whole scale of values is inevitably altered. A tiresome and unrewarded bit of work, a so-called legitimate bit of self-indulgence, look quite different according to whether they are seen inside or outside this atmosphere of prayer. Inside it, our standards are those of spirits related to God; outside it, our standards are very often those of clever animals playing for their own hand. At the very least, then, the effect of such prayer on the soul can hardly fail to be that which St. Teresa demanded as her test of its efficacy: it must at



least teach us to love, suffer, and work on ever higher levels of reality and self-devotion. I am sure we can all look round and recognize lives in which such an enhancement as this has silently but clearly taken place.

And much more than this is possible to those who let this mighty educative influence play upon them in all its generous, fertilizing power; training those minds, which philosophy has described as our means of access to reality, to recognize more and more fully, both with and without sense symbols, the rich and living fact of God, and to relate to that living fact the stream of events which constitutes our outward life. To put it in psychological language, the central possibilities of the life of prayer, as regards the individual soul, are first a deepening religious sensitiveness, a real cultivation of our latent capacity for God; and next a complete redirection of desire, a dedication of those powers of initiative and endurance which every living creature possesses in a greater or less degree, to the single purposes of God. It is within the atmosphere of prayer, and only within that atmosphere, that those amazing dramas of the spiritual life that shine out in the history of religion are carried through. Psychologists studying conversion sometimes fail to remember this. They forget that as it is the after-history of the case, and not just the operation, that matters, so it is the steady life of prayer which the conversion sets going, and not the startling crisis in which such conversions begin, which gradually converts the penitent into the saint; as a real garden is made, not by sticking in plants, but by unremitting cultivation of the soil. We see this factor clearly in the story of that immense transformation which turned Augustine from a sensual and conceited young don into one of the Fathers of the Church. It was such loving, continuous and persevering communion with the world of spirit which transformed Catherine of Genoa from a melancholy and disillusioned woman into a great mother of souls. The hours she spent in prayer, and the other hours which she spent in doing the things to which she was impelled in her prayer, were those that really mattered in her life. During her formative years, St. Catherine prayed for five or six hours a day; thus was produced that habitual state of union with God which governed her life. To the same influence we owe the maturing of such souls as Charles de Foucauld, Elizabeth Leseur, the Sadhu, and many other modern saints.

Nor does this inner transformation exhaust the possibilities of prayer in the individual soul. These possibilities include, too, such an enhancement of physical powers of resistance as we see, for instance, in Foucauld or Mary Slessor; or, as in Madame Leseur, that sublimation of suffering which turns it



from a sterile into a fertile thing. Moreover, such prayer effects a gentle and indescribable sensitization of the spirit; gradually bringing the real man or woman of prayer into a state in which the spiritual currents active below the surface of life, those contractions and expansions of the soul which are a sure guide to our spiritual state and the secret impulses of God, are actually felt. Isn't it rather a waste, that only a small proportion of Christians take supernatural prayer seriously enough to produce these results? For although such results in their fulness may be the privilege of the saints, we cannot elude our own spiritual obligations merely by drawing attention to that fact. In our own small way, something of this should be possible for us all. Everybody reads and likes Brother Lawrence's little book on *The Practice of the Presence of God*. It is considered quite simple, and suitable for everybody's use. But I sometimes wonder how many of those who read and enjoy it have any idea at all what it was that Brother Lawrence knew and experienced, and was struggling to make other people see. I am sure that it was something far deeper and more difficult than is generally supposed. You remember how he once exclaimed that men were to be pitied because they content themselves with so little; and then went on to say:

"God's treasure is like an infinite ocean, yet a little wave of feeling, passing with the moment, contents us. Blind as we are, we hinder God, and stop the current of His graces. But when He finds a soul permeated with a living faith, He pours into it His graces and His favours plenteously; into the soul they flow, like a torrent, which, after being forcibly stopped against its ordinary course, when it has found a passage, spreads with impetuosity its pent-up flood."

There we get in one simple image a description of the individual soul's possibilities in the life of prayer; and we see that those possibilities involve access to actual sources of light, love, certitude, more abundant life. It is the realization of this solid truth that seems to me so desperately needed in the ordinary run of the Christian life. We do or we can tap a great power when we direct our undivided interest and our desire towards the Eternal in prayer; but so many of us are content with our first tiny achievements and stop short at that. We are like children who have been given a crystal set, and hurriedly tuning it in, are pleased and astonished to hear a distant voice that murmurs "Further outlook, unsettled." But with more patience and devotedness, more careful, quiet adjustment, that same apparatus might transmit to us the heavenly melodies, once we had taken the trouble to get the wave-length right.

Surely in this matter of getting and using spiritual power, our



span of desire is miserably inadequate? We do manage various little things, and the results of this amount of faith are often considered startling and impressive. Yet how seldom we realize that even these little achievements show that we stand on the verge of a great world of possibilities, and are in touch with powers of which the full span cannot be conceived by us: powers most truly given by God to the spirit of man, a world in which creation on spiritual levels can go forward, a world of which the limitations have not been seen by any human soul. When we find this out as a reality—and finding it out as a reality is exactly what the New Testament means by the word “faith”—we begin to be able to do things which we could not do before. We may even begin to acquire some of that strange power of transcending circumstance so conspicuous in the lives of the saints; even though perhaps this may only operate over the ordinary ups and downs of life, conditions of health and sickness, apparently insuperable obstacles in work or career. History shows us mature souls, who move securely in this supernatural life, going out unharmed on dangerous journeys as Livingstone did; or living like Mary Slessor, under conditions of food and surroundings which Europeans cannot normally survive. But this does not happen to them merely because they believe that it is possible for it to happen to them. It can and does only happen to them in so far as they are true persons of prayer; and in so far, too, as their prayer is controlled by utter confidence and self-oblation, and not by anxious demand. Such possibilities will never be actualized if they are once allowed to usurp the central place in the devotional life; to be its objectives instead of its by-products. They are given; and their reception depends on the fact that the soul's orientation to the Giver is steadfastly maintained. All sanctification, all supernatural growth and effectiveness, depend wholly on the initial movements of self-oblivious and non-utilitarian worship, opening up the soul to the supernatural sun, and so convincing it once for all that all the possibilities of power, light, certitude, and joy, which man can realize in his prayer, are given and not self-induced. All depends here on that which Ruysbroeck so wonderfully called “the wide-open gaze, the simple seeing and staring.”

Such simple contemplation has been, beyond all other things, the supreme formative influence in the making of the saints. It exerts a power over human character which is unique both in kind and degree. It may emerge from a type of prayer that is humble and even mechanical; and may at first be exercised in blind faith, with but little sense of reality. But as it develops, will and desire are gradually and inevitably transferred from



lower to higher centres of interest; and the true life of the self is anchored ever more firmly in the eternal world to which it belongs. Such prayer can simplify and weave together that mixed life of devotion and action, of faith and works, to which most Christians are called; bringing all external actions of whatever kind into direct relationship with God. Christianity has always taught that work of every kind *can* be a prayer; but it will not *be* a prayer unless we make it so, by doing it within the atmosphere of Eternity. In those who do this, physical and mental labour, as well as direct spiritual labour, can become the vehicles of spiritual action. All their odd jobs get woven into their life of prayer; and they can imitate without insincerity the holy woman who boiled her potatoes for the intentions of those for whom she had not time to pray.

The third class of possibilities inherent in the life of prayer—the powers it can develop and exert as towards other souls—depends absolutely on the growth, expansion and simplification of personality which has been produced in us by the prayer of adoration and of self-discipline. That which you are here going to transmit will be strictly relative to that which you are able to receive. That attention to God and self-mergence in Him which works the transformation of character and feeds our souls, also conditions our power of attending to and penetrating other souls in prayer. And if grace and will rise and fall together; so most assuredly do purity of intention and spiritual effectiveness rise and fall together. If we thought of the first possibility of prayer as the ever-greater entrance into, and adoration of, that which God reveals to loving attentiveness, and compared it with the results achieved by the self-forgetful gazing of the artist; and of the second possibility, as a training and a profound changing of us, enabling us to correspond with, draw upon, and deal with that deeper vision of reality—the artist's education in his craft—then the third range of possibilities may represent what he does with that revelation and that craftsmanship; the creative aspect of prayer.

Once more, this metaphor must never be thought of as adequate to the theme with which it deals. For it is here, in looking at the possibilities and achievements of redemptive and intercessory prayer, that we find most sharply brought home to us the concrete reality of supernatural action; its distinctness in kind from mental action, even though it may avail itself of mental vehicles and means.

The possibilities inherent in what is generally called intercession are realized in widely different degrees by different souls: for there is included in this that strange power of one spirit to penetrate, illuminate, support and rescue other spirits,



through which so much of the spiritual work of the world seems to be done. And if some are called very specially to develop in contemplative prayer the possibilities of adoring devotion, others seem no less surely called to the strange and often painful paths of redemptive prayer. We see this in the lives of the historic saints, though not only in their lives. And it is really only by attributing a certain literalness to that which they say and do in this matter, that we can begin to understand the sufferings to which they are drawn; the sort of engine which God can and does make out of human material, for the furtherance of His saving work.

St. Catherine of Siena, at the height of her powers, said: "God has sent me among you to taste and devour souls." A strange thing to say; yet it was said, not by a person who was in any sense queer religiously, but by one of the greatest women ever produced by the Church of Christ—a woman who did again and again save others, by taking on herself the burden and suffering of their sins. And the same sort of claim has been made, the same sort of power exhibited, by equally real and solid, if less amazing, personalities. "God *enabled* me to agonize in prayer," said David Brainerd, the saintly Evangelical leader. "My soul was drawn out very much for the world. I grasped for a multitude of souls." Does not all this give us a sense of unreached spiritual possibilities; of deep mysterious energies accessible to those who will pay the price? Does it not bring home the fact that real intercession is not a request, but a piece of work; and a piece of work which is not likely to succeed, unless we come to it with the full intention of doing our best? That wonderful spirit, Elizabeth Leseur, has in her Journal a very striking passage, in which she says:

"I believe that there circulates among all souls, those here below, those who are being purified, and those who have achieved the true life, a vast and ceaseless stream made of the sufferings, the merits, and the love of all those souls: and that even our smallest pains, our least efforts, can, through the divine action, reach other souls both dear and distant, and bring to them light, peace, and holiness."

If that can be done, if those little pains and trifling efforts, present in every human life, can thus be supernaturalized, made dynamic, this can only be done in so far as they are transfused by the atmosphere of prayer: a prayer based on adoration and self-oblation. And it can be done like that. Look what this means in the way of possibility. It means removing all the ups and downs, the health and sickness, the tension and delight, the suffering and the love of human life, to the level of an efficacious sacrament: filling them all with God. It means that



our spiritual action one on another—or rather, the action of Almighty God on others through us—is not to be limited by the bounds of what are usually called “religious acts.” It means a life in which the successive and the unchanging, the activities of sense and the deep action of spirit, are integrated, and serve together the single purpose of Eternal Life. This is the life of continuous prayer; and this is the possibility which is set before every Christian soul.

EVELYN UNDERHILL.

## THE RISEN LORD

### I

IN a recent issue of the *Spectator* there was a review of Mr. P. Gardner-Smith's book on *The Narratives of the Resurrection*, and towards its close the following words are found: “To our thinking the accounts of the resurrection invite analysis, in the light of present-day thought—analysis which might well prove constructive and confirmatory.” This is, I believe, true. It may well be that help may be derived for us from the advances made in psychology and physical science.

Already not a little has been done in the case of psychology. The recent progress of that science has emphasized the significance of certain details in the accounts of the resurrection and the subsequent appearance of our Lord. Mr. Selwyn's article in *Essays Catholic and Critical* is a notable example of this. There he investigates, in the light of modern psychological knowledge, the accounts of our Lord's appearances; and he discusses the vision theories in connexion with what is told us by investigators of the mystical life generally. In the details supplied to us by the Gospels, criticism has found difficulties which lead in its view to the discrediting of the narratives; but Mr. Selwyn, on the other hand, finds in these very details facts that are congruous with what psychology tells us is normal in mystical experiences. He thus feels that the psychological approach to the interpretation of the appearances yields not a little to aid those that feel impelled to adopt the vision theory. But, while this is so, he points out the deficiency of that theory as a full explanation of the problem presented. He shows that “it does not reach in itself to the Catholic belief in Christ's resurrection,” and that “it is a doctrine of the foundation of the Church rather than of His resurrection from the dead.” In fact, all that the visions could prove is that Jesus was immortal in the sense that He survived



death: they would be no proof that by rising from the dead He had conquered death.

Thus, then, though psychology may help us to understand somewhat more fully the nature of His appearances, it does nothing to help us to solve the problem of the empty tomb. And without doubt this latter is the problem that creates the chief difficulties of many thoughtful minds to-day. The resurrection and the subsequent events connected with it in the Gospels seem to be contrary to what we consider from experience to be the true properties of "matter." Matter is, in our ordinary experience, just the one thing that seems to be in its nature ultimately impenetrable. Yet our Lord's body, "material" in substance, is described as passing out of the sealed tomb, and after the resurrection as passing through walls and appearing and disappearing at will. Our difficulties here are not psychological, but physical. And it seems to me that as modern psychology has been found helpful to those who hold the vision theories, so modern physical science may be found helpful to those who, feeling the inadequacy of these, still realize the difficulties that present themselves from the physical side. We have to remember that if modern psychology has greatly enlarged our knowledge of the psychic part of human nature, physical science has greatly enlarged our knowledge of the material. Our whole view of the constitution of "matter" has been revolutionized. No longer are we to think of the atoms of which it is composed as being ultimately indissoluble "mass" (however infinitesimal in size), but rather as being forms of energy and therefore capable of transformation and even of dissolution. These facts are now very generally known; but in order that they may with some vividness be before our minds, I think it best for our purpose to describe them with some particularity. This will be to depart for a short space from theological consideration, but I think by doing so I may be the more able to make my meaning clear.\*

Professor Bonney in his *Present Relation of Science and Religion* tells us that centuries before Dalton propounded his chemical atomic theory sundry philosophers had maintained an atomic constitution in "matter." He quotes Sir Isaac Newton as deeming it probable "that God in the beginning formed matter in solid, massy, hard, impenetrable, movable

\* The following scientific facts are taken chiefly from Mr. Bertrand Russell's *The ABC of Atoms*. In what I have written I have not infrequently used his words, and make this general acknowledgment. There is perhaps some little satisfaction to be found in using a work by this writer in an endeavour to make faith easier! But, indeed, we owe him a debt of gratitude for the lucidity with which he discloses to us the mystery of the atom. I have also quoted from Professor Bonney's *Present Relation of Science and Religion*, the opening chapter of which will be found to give considerable help.



particles, of such sizes and figures, and with such other properties, and in such other proportions, as most conduced to the end for which He formed them; and that these primitive particles, being solids, are incomparably harder than any porous bodies compounded of them; even so very hard as never to wear or break in pieces. . . . Now, by the help of these principles, all material things seem to have been composed of the hard and solid particles above mentioned." Such a view of the constitution of matter necessarily led to the resurrection and appearances being regarded as the result of miraculous violations of the laws of nature; an explanation which we now find it hard to accept. Now, while we are aware that Science has shown us that the atom is by no means the solid, indissoluble entity described by Newton, I think we are finding it extremely difficult to emancipate our thoughts from the old ideas and their associations. These old ideas are so congruous with what appears, that we find it difficult to re-orientate our minds.

## II

Let us, then, consider what modern science has to tell. It informs us that the atom has now been measured and weighed and its internal life explored. An atom of hydrogen weighs about a million-millionth of a million-millionth of a gramme and a half; and its diameter under normal conditions is about a hundred-millionth of the third of an inch. The atom is a kind of a solar system consisting of a nucleus which has electrons revolving round it. The nucleus is composed of positive electricity, the electrons of negative. The atom differs from the solar system in that it is not gravity that makes the electrons go round the nucleus. This motion is caused by the fact that positive and negative electricity attracts its opposite and repels its own kind. The electrons go round their tiny orbit at the rate of 1,400 miles a second. The diameter of an electron is less than the hundred-thousandth part of an atom; their relative sizes have been compared by the illustration of a mouse roaming about inside a cathedral. The word "atom" originally meant "indivisible"; but we now know that what we call atoms can be cut up. As the atom is built up of smaller things, we would expect to find that its structure could be destroyed, just as a house can be knocked down and reduced to a heap of bricks. We now know that this sort of thing does happen. And physicists have all but succeeded in reducing matter to two different kinds of units, one (the hydrogen nucleus) bearing positive electricity, and the other (the electron)



bearing negative electricity. We may assume, though not with complete certainty, that all matter consists of hydrogen nuclei and electrons, which are therefore the only "elements" in the strict sense of the word. A still further result to research is possible. It may be found that the "ether" is after all what is really fundamental, and that electrons and hydrogen nuclei are merely states of strain in ether. If so the two elements may be reduced to one, and the atomic character of matter may turn out to be not the ultimate truth. Thus our conception of the atom as something definitely hard and solid, the most persistent and immutable thing that exists in nature, is changed into a conception of it as a separate system of moving units. And it is conceivable, and some of the authorities have suggested the circumstances under which such an event could occur, that the whole fabric of the universe might vanish, leaving "not a wrack behind" except ether and the electrons. In the mind of the modern physicist the material universe and everything in it, not excepting our own bodies, can be traced back to ether and an operation of energy.

We must not pause to dwell on the wonders of God's creation thus revealed to us by science, nor on their bearing on the spiritual interpretation of nature, but merely point out that if it be true that matter is in its ultimate analysis an operation of energy or a strain in the ether, our thoughts as to its possible modifications become vastly enlarged, and its transformation or dissolution becomes at once conceivable.

I am thus brought to the object of this paper—namely, to suggest, as the reviewer in the *Spectator*, whom I quoted at the beginning, suggested, that an analysis of the accounts of the resurrection in the light of present-day thought may lead to helpful results. Very probably that writer was thinking chiefly of psychology, but physics may also have a contribution to make.

### III

In dealing with the nature of our Lord's risen body, one necessarily feels that we are venturing on holy ground; but I trust it may be done without lack of reverence. There is the material side to this divine mystery, and I think that the new light thrown by physical science has a very real bearing upon it. There is the physical side. The material body of our Lord was laid in the tomb, and it was no longer there after the resurrection. In His resurrection we believe He passed back to that glorified state from which in His humility and compassion He had come, and that this passing involved the disappearance



from this earth of the body He assumed in the Incarnation. How did it disappear? We are doubtless familiar with Latham's theory of the evanescence or exhalation of the body through the grave-clothes; and it seems to me that if this theory be reconsidered in the light of the new facts disclosed by science regarding the constitution of "matter," we are enabled with less hesitation to accept it as a possible explanation of the facts narrated in the Gospels.

Latham felt that the generally received opinion as to the impenetrability of matter influenced those who rejected his theory. And it is interesting to recall that he more than once suggested the possibility of science so altering its views as to render his interpretation more readily acceptable. In his Preface he says: "There are certain profound questions of physical science, such as those concerning the nature and existence of matter, to which our subject brings us near; these are engaging the attention of the leaders of that department, and twenty years hence men may think very differently on these points from what they do now"; again, on p. 25, he says: "It is even credible that someone might come to my help with an argument from the scientific side. 'Matter,' it may be said, is an illusive term. There may be nothing of the sort, but only forces; 'substances' may be a congeries of centres of attraction." These words were written twenty-five years ago when the new discoveries were beginning to dawn on the world, and they show a remarkable prescience. Science has "come to his help." Matter is not "mass" but "energy": and energy (as experience shows us) can be transformed or transmuted.

It follows, therefore, that as matter can be dissipated by transformation or transmutation, the evanescence of our Lord's body (if it occurred) is not contrary to what we know to be the physical laws of "nature." We are thus in a position to consider, without hesitation from the physical side, the interpretation offered to us by Latham. It will be remembered that he largely bases his suggestion on the account given of the visit of St. Peter and St. John to the tomb, and on the impression made on them by the position in which they saw the clothes lying.

The impression made on St. John was so great that "he saw and believed." To interpret this as meaning no more than that he was convinced that our Lord's body had been removed as Mary had told them, is meagre in the extreme. The fact that the narrative draws attention to the "lying" of the clothes is in itself remarkable. If there was no meaning in what they saw in their arrangement it is difficult to understand why they were mentioned at all. A great change was wrought in the



Apostles by what they saw; and what they saw was the clothes. Hence their significance. They revealed to them that the body had not been taken away and laid they knew not where; but that in some mysterious way it had passed from its cerements. Their Lord had, conquering death, passed in the completeness of His personality into the spiritual world. And so they "went away into their own home," and did not, as otherwise they would have done, commence a search for the remains of their loved Master.\*

## IV

By the resurrection of our Lord we mean that He in the fulness of His humanity (body, soul, and spirit) passed from the "natural" into the "spiritual" world. It is impossible to form any conception of the nature of a "spiritual" body. But we believe, I take it, that as He was clothed with a material body when on earth, so in that higher world to which He returned He was clothed with what corresponds with what we know as "body" in this. But further we believe that there is in some sense an identity between the earthly body and the heavenly, as otherwise the former could not be spoken of as "risen." Glorification in our minds implies development, and so alteration, but nevertheless continuity. Now is not this transcendent mystery made more possible to our thoughts by the knowledge of the true nature of "matter"? As "energy" constitutes the material body, may it not, in its passage from this earthly "lower degree of reality" to the heavenly "higher degree of reality," be conceived of as passing through material wrappings without disturbing them, and as becoming transformed into that which is analogous to matter in the higher? This line of thought may also help us to enter more fully into the teaching St. Paul gives us regarding the instantaneous transformation of those who will be "alive and remain" at the coming of our Lord. He says: "We shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. . . . This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." This is perhaps a less difficult thought when our minds grasp the teaching of modern science than when we held the older view. If the thought of our Lord's resurrection has been made easier to us, then the

\* Latham, p. 95 f., adds in a note a passage taken from Bishop Ellicott's *Lectures*, p. 384, in which the Bishop says: "The ground of the belief was the position of the grave-clothes, which was inconsistent with the supposition of a removal of the body by enemies," and he quotes Cyril Alex. in *Joann.*, vol. iv., p. 1078 (ed. Aubert), ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ὀθονίων συλλογῆς ἐννοοῦσι τὴν ἀνάστασιν; and he adds: "The Greek of St. Cyril may be roughly rendered, 'From the manner in which the clothes lay folded, they are led to the idea of the resurrection.'" The arrangement of the clothes convinced them.



thought of the instantaneous transformation of those living at His parousia has also been made easier.

But if this knowledge assists our thoughts in their endeavour to understand the resurrection, does it not also help us to understand the appearances? These appearances are described in the Gospel as being material. The vision theory seems to reproduce exactly what the disciples themselves first wrongly thought when He appeared in their midst; they "were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit." But our Lord, wishing to show them that He was not mere spirit, deals with them, as Latham points out, "in a purely practical way. . . . He offers His body for them to handle. Their awe, however, is too overpowering, and no one dares to put forth his hand. Then our Lord takes another course. . . . He says to them, 'Have ye here anything to eat?' And they gave him a piece of broiled fish, and He took it and did eat before them." His body was as "material" as before the resurrection. It must be remembered that in these appearances we have a *re-entry* of our Lord into the "material" from the "spiritual." He was not in the spiritual realm clothed with "matter"; but may it not be that on re-entering the "material," the "energy" that had once formed His earthly body, and that had been glorified into His spiritual body, now on its re-entrance into the "material" re-formed into "matter." It would thus be a real body of this earth that He showed them, but it was not, if our suggestion be regarded as not too bold, a new creation of insoluble atoms, but the rearrangement of energy in correspondence with the nature of the world He re-entered. In a phrase of Browning, He, at His will, "decomposed but to recompose."

To me this does not seem difficult to believe as possible, especially when we recall who He was. What limit can be put to the power over matter of a superhuman will? If such really was His action we can see nothing in it contrary to the laws of nature as far as they are known to us. It is a question of the transmutation of energy, not a question of "matter" being used in a way contrary to its constitution. Is it inconceivable that He who by His return to heaven glorified matter had the power of periodically investing Himself with it, in its earthly form, whenever He wished to appear on earth. The mystery of the appearances would thus be of the same nature, but the reverse of the mystery of the resurrection; the latter being the transformation of the "energy" from the earthly to the heavenly, the former its transformation from the heavenly to the earthly.

Further, do we not see in our Lord's risen body matter with



added powers—or rather matter more subservient to His will than before its glorification? It seems to be “an instrument wholly under His hand.” His glorified human soul is clothed with a glorified body, and this body “recomposed” on earth seems exactly to express the wish of His personality. In some measure here on earth form of body expresses character; perhaps with the spiritual body that expression is exact. And so He looked what He wished to look; He expressed what His thoughts were. If He wished not to be recognized, He was not recognized. We feel, even for ourselves, the measure of truth in Spenser’s

For of the soul the body form doth take,  
For soul is form, and doth the body make.

Perchance in the risen Lord it was absolutely so. The risen body of Christ appears to have been the perfectly obedient, sensitive agent of His will.

But also it seems that such a body is in some sense in continuity with the past. “He showed them His hands and His side.” The wound prints are there. How otherwise? For personality is, in one aspect, the sum of our experiences; and we know (alas! too well) what mankind caused Him to experience.

Further, if we have been right in saying that the mystery of His vanishing from the tomb is of the same nature as the mystery of the appearances and disappearances, cannot the same be said of the Ascension? What distinguishes His final disappearance from His previous is that by its outward circumstances it conveyed the idea of being the last in time: final until His return when time shall be no more. At the Ascension He did not merely vanish. He rose from the earth, and a cloud veiled the actual disappearance. In Westcott’s words: “the physical elevation was a speaking parable, an eloquent symbol.” He taught them not to expect further periodic appearances.

Finally, may we not say that we may see, perhaps more clearly than formerly, how in the risen body of our Lord we have a pledge of redemption of “matter”? St. Paul speaks of creation being subject to vanity in hope that it shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. Apparently he feels that matter, as we experience it, is not to be annihilated, but renewed. Nor, I think, can the Church look forward to any less comprehensive issue, believing as she does in the Incarnation whereby God assumed “matter,” and in the resurrection whereby He glorified it. The very dust of this struggling world has been raised to the throne of God, and we begin to see somewhat of the meaning



of Isaiah's promise of a new heaven and new earth; of St. Peter's prediction of a restoration of all things, and of the vision of the Apocalypse of all things made new. The consummation of the age may be, not the destruction of "mass," but the readaptation of that "energy" which by its activity seems to be but a manifestation of the very life of God Himself.

CHARLES T. P. DOWN.

## THE DEUTERONOMIC BACKGROUND OF THE LOGIA—II.

"AT that season" (Matt. xii. 1) is not found in Mark and Luke. It is possible that Matthew by this connecting link suggests a chronological order of events. If chapter xi. refers to New Year's Day, the cornfield incident and the cure of the man with a withered hand took place on the Sabbath following the New Year's Day and before the Day of Atonement. That Sabbath being "the Sabbath of Repentance" and the Haphtara being Hosea xlv. 2 f. ("Return, O Israel"), the argument (verse 7) would be most appropriate, particularly as sins against fellow-men were, according to Jewish tradition, especially considered at this season (cf. Yoma viii. 9: "Transgressions between man and his neighbour the Day of Atonement does not expiate until his companion be reconciled"). This would explain the remarkable reading in Luke, "second first Sabbath"; the Sabbath before the New Year being "the first"—i.e., the great—and this the "second great." A Sabbath before a great festival was probably called even in the first century "a great Sabbath." (For later times cf. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst*, p. 550; cf. also *J.Q.R.*, v. 434 f.) As there were three "Punishment Sabbaths" and "Seven Consolation Sabbaths," the Sabbath before New Year's Day and that before the Day of Atonement were, so to say, two "Lenten" Sabbaths (cf. H. St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, p. 83).

Both the Pentateuchal and the Prophetic lessons (Deut. xxxii.; Hos. xiv. 2 f.) for the Sabbath before the Day of Atonement most probably provided our Lord with certain *motifs* for His arguments. We have already shown the liturgical background of chapter xi.—e.g., the idea of judgment in connexion with New Year's Day (cf. Matt. xi. 22, 24 with Deut. xxxii. 35, 36; "this generation," in verse 16, with Deuteronomy, *ibid.*, 5, "a crooked generation"; "Sodom," in verse 23, with Deuteronomy, *ibid.*, 32; the "Wilderness," in verse 7, with Deuteronomy, *ibid.*, 10, 13).



On the other hand, some of the lessons for New Year's Day form a background for the argument used in Matthew xii. 5, 7 (not found in Mark and Luke). One of the lessons for this day was Numbers xxix. 1-6 (verses 1-2 of which read: "In the seventh month, on the first day of the month"—i.e., on New Year's Day—"Ye shall *do no work of service* and *ye shall offer a burnt offering*"), and the preceding chapter, dealing with sacrifices, begins (Num. xxviii. 2) with the following words: "My sacrifices . . . shall ye observe to offer unto me *in their due season*," on which words the Halakic Midrash bases the principle that Sabbath laws did not apply to the work of the priests in the Sanctuary (cf. Sifre on Num. § 142; Jubil. 1, 10f.; M. Pes. vi. f.).

Matthew probably found in the *Logia* the connecting link between the incident of the cure of the blind and dumb demoniac (xii. 22); the Beelzebul controversy (24-37); the request for a sign (38-42); the parable of the unclean spirit's return (43-45); the section verses 46-50 (the mother and brethren of Jesus), and the preceding narratives.

The liturgical factor, and hence the Deuteronomic and Deutero-Isaianic background, is here almost obvious. If Matthew xii. 1-13 took place on the "Sabbath of Repentance," between New Year's Day and the Day of Atonement, the Beelzebul controversy and the request for a sign have all the *motifs* taken from the Day of Atonement.

One of the characteristic aspects of this season is Israel's struggle against Satan. The case of Israel is tried before the Supreme Court of Heaven, and Satan appears before God with all his accusations against the people. On New Year's Day the books, containing the records of the deeds of men, are opened, and from this day to the Day of Atonement ("the fearful days," *yomim noraim*) the people endeavour by earnest repentance to tip the balance in their favour.

In Rabbinic literature we frequently read of the many Satanic accusations brought against Israel on the Day of Atonement (and on the Great Day of Judgment)—e.g., when the High Priest enters the Holy of Holies, Satan accompanies him in order to accuse Israel before God (cf. Pes. Rab. xl.-xlv.). In Pirke R. Eliezer (cf. Yoma 67b), Azazel comes to bring a ransom for Samael (=Satan—Saturn—Keiwan, cf. Amos v. 26). Azael (another name for the chief of the fallen angels) has not yet repented and still seduces humankind, making necessary the particular sacrifices of the Day of Atonement (Midr. Abkir). In connexion with Psalm lxxxii. 5f., Pesikta Rabbati, chapter xlv., gives a dramatic picture of Satan's activities on the Day of Atonement. Satan appears before God with all the sins of



Israel and says: "Lord of the World, the nations have adulterers, so has Israel; the nations have thieves, so has Israel." He enumerates all kinds of sins and piles them on to the scale against Israel. God enumerates Israel's *good* qualities. The balance is equal. Satan, unsatisfied with this result, departs to seek more sins with which to tip the balance; while he is away, God removes the sins of Israel from the scales and hides them "under His robes."

The confession of sin, *Viddui*, is naturally another element in the ritual of the Day, and is the first condition of forgiveness; among the sins enumerated are "blasphemy," "evil tongue," "unfounded hatred" (cf. Matt. xii. 31, 32, 34, 36). It is unnecessary to point out the connexion of *forgiveness* with the Day of Atonement (verse 31, "All manner of *sin* and *blasphemy* shall be *forgiven* unto men"). On the Day of Atonement Moses finally came down from the Mount, bringing forgiveness for the sin of the Golden Calf (Seder Olam, ed. Ratner, p. 15a, cf. Baba Batra, 121a).

To many scholars the saying in Matthew xii. 34 seems to be too harsh to have been uttered by our Lord (cf. Montefiore and McNeale, *ad loc.*). But, taking into consideration the probable liturgical background (cf. Deut. xxxii. 33 and Isa. lxiii. 10), this seeming harshness is mitigated, for, with prophetic insight, our Lord saw that an evil disposition had become to the Pharisees their second nature, and out of this evil nature their malicious judgments arose.

The heart of man is a treasure house, in which are stored good or evil thoughts and wishes, and his utterances correspond with the nature of his accumulated treasure. In Deuteronomy xxxiii., one of the lessons for the season, we find both a key to "generation of vipers" in verse 35 (cf. verse 5), and also this simile of a treasure stored up, in verse 34. It is also remarkable that in the High Priest's prayer on the Day of Atonement the following words are found: "Open to us thy *good treasure*" (Mishna Yoma).

On the Day of Judgment an account will be required of every "idle word" (cf. Pes. Rab., p. 172), and to put forward for this slander the excuse of a non-serious intention will not avail, for the Great Judge will justify or condemn each one according to his own words (cf. Luke xix. 22), since they are the natural outflow of the heart, and reveal the inner tendencies of the personality. The use of the singular in verse 37 indicates that it is an echo of Psalm li. 6, probably one of the psalms of the season, since it deals with sin, repentance, and forgiveness.

For a better understanding of Matthew xii. 38-42 (the request for a sign), it is important to realize that *the Book of*



*Jonah* was one of the Prophetic lessons for the Day of Atonement, and Deuteronomy xviii. 10-22 is undoubtedly connected with our Lord's reply to the desire of the Scribes and Pharisees for an exceptional sign. In the latter passage the injunction to Israel not to tolerate sorcery is found, and from verse 15 on "the Prophet like unto Moses" is spoken of, which passage must have been interpreted messianically, at least in some circles (see Acts iii. 22, vii. 37). It is very probable that this passage concerning sorcery and the sign of the true prophet was in the minds of the Scribes and Pharisees when they asked for a sign, they being at this time not yet actually hostile, but rather bewildered and sceptical, and considering our Lord's miracles of healing as sorcery, especially because of His "violation" of the Sabbath.

He could not be a true prophet, still less the "prophet like unto Moses," they argued. Yet, probably some of them had misgivings, and hence their request for a sign which, in that Deuteronomic passage, was a test of the true prophet. If he only would tell them something about the future by which they might judge Him! Our Lord gives no direct answer to them, but turns to others present (*cf.* verse 46) and speaks of the condition of the whole contemporary Jewish people as it expresses itself in this demand of the Pharisees for a sign. Instead of believing the testimony of Jesus in word and deed, they desire a sign which should make moral and spiritual conviction superfluous. The only sign accorded them is "the sign of Jonah"—*i.e.*, as Jonah preached repentance to the Gentiles with success, as the Synagogal lesson of the Day of Atonement would have brought to their minds, so, a time will arrive when the Gentiles will hear and accept His gospel, whilst Israel will reject it. Verse 40 is the Evangelist's own interpretation of our Lord's words. At the time when the Gospel was written it was preached to the Gentiles and accepted by them on the basis of the *Resurrection*. Matthew xii. 41 and 42 gain in force when contrasted with the Rabbinic idea that the Day of Atonement brought forgiveness to Israel only, and not to the Gentiles (*cf.* *Pes. Rab.*, xlv., p. 185b), and especially when the fact that the *Book of Jonah* was one of the lessons for the Day of Atonement is kept in mind. One of the other lessons was certainly Isaiah lviii (in which verse 2, "Yet they seek me daily and delight to know my ways," is spoken ironically by the prophet, and compare this with Matthew xii. 38, 39; and verse 9, "speaking vanity"—*i.e.*, idle words—with Matthew xii. 36). Isaiah lix. was probably another of the lessons (*cf.* verse 5, *Jahwe has none to help Him* in His fight against his enemies, with Matthew xii. 29, 30, where our Lord is the One who binds the



"strong man" and "gathers" the powers of good. With Matthew xii. 31, 32, *cf.* Isaiah lxiii. 10, "*they grieved his Holy Spirit*"). In Isaiah lxiii. 15 we even find a hint of a suggestion for "Beelzebul" (that this is the correct reading has been shown by Zahn on Matthew). The meaning of the words, "the Baal, or Lord, of the dwelling," is probably the *motif* for the comparison made by our Lord (*cf.* Matt. xii. 25, 26) and in the parable of the unclean spirit (verses 43-45), where in both cases the demon takes possession of the person and makes him his *dwelling-place* (*zebul*).

This parable aptly rounds off the passage. Once the Day of Atonement was over, they thought themselves clean, purified from all evil (*cf.* Yoma, 85b), and forgiven for all the sins of the past year; but by their attitude to Jesus, by their blasphemy of *the Spirit*, by their idle words (scandalous words spoken without serious meaning, *cf.* verse 24), they show that, notwithstanding all the purification (verse 44, "empty, swept and garnished"), they are a tempting habitation (*zebul*) for the Evil One.

From Pesikta Rabbati we gather that Psalm lxiii. was one of the psalms sung on the Day of Atonement, and probably the title, as well as verse 2b ("in a desert land," etc.), suggested the phraseology of this section (*cf.* the Greek of verse 43 with Psa. lxiii. 2, lxx.).

Apart from the Deuteronomic background, which colours the seemingly harsh expressions of our Lord in addressing the Scribes and Pharisees ("wicked generations," verse 45; "an evil and adulterous generation," verse 39; "generation of vipers," verse 34), there is ample proof that such expressions were not unmerited at the time, and even later. Burkitt (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 170-174) tries to make a distinction between Rabbinic Judaism and its teachers before and after the destruction of the Temple. But that the Rabbis, even after Hadrian and Bar Cochba, notwithstanding their change of outlook in some respects, and some highly spiritual sayings of theirs preserved in the Midrashic and Talmudic literature, did not give up the absurdity and sin of identifying the source of good in Christ's miracles with the Satanic power of evil, there is ample proof (*cf.* Sanh. 43a: "Forty days before the Eve of Passover the Crier called out through the streets: 'Jesus of Nazareth is about to be stoned because *he performed witchcraft* and misled Israel. Anyone who has some good to say of him, let him come forward and say it!' and there was none that came forward; and they hanged him on the Eve of Passover"; *cf.* also Justin, *Dial. cum Tryphone Judæo*, chapter 69).

Neither Mark nor Luke gives any indication of the time when



the Mother and brethren of our Lord appeared on the scene, but Matthew expressly connects the event (verse 46-50) with the previous utterance, "while he yet talked to the people." It has already been pointed out that the "Song of Moses" (Deut. xxxii.) was the lesson for the Sabbath before the Day of Atonement, and presenting, as it does, a picture of the future history of Israel, was probably the background of our Lord's prophetic utterance concerning "this generation" (cf. Deut. xxxii. 5). The "Blessing of Moses" (Deut. xxxiii.) follows immediately after, where in verse 9 it says of Levi: "He who said to his father and to his mother, I have not seen them, and his brothers he does not recognize, and his sons he does not know"—i.e., the sons of Levi considered the will of God as of greater importance than the attachment to their nearest relations.

The connecting link between the parable chapter (xiii. 1-53) and chapter xii. seems to be this. In xii. 43-50 we have the contrast between the people moving on towards an evil future (the impure spirit's return, 43-45) and the disciples of Jesus (46-50); in chapter xiii. we have a picture of the different methods which our Lord applied in teaching the multitude and the disciples. The liturgical factor can also be discerned here. The Feast of Tabernacles follows the Day of Atonement, and one of the lessons for the last day of the Feast is Deuteronomy xxxiii.-xxxiv, the "Blessing of Moses" and his death. In the "Blessing" we have a description in parabolic similes of the earthly kingdom of Israel (cf. verses 5, "a King in Yeshurun," and verses 11-28), ending up (verse 29) with, "Blessed art thou, O Israel" (cf. Matt. xiii. 16: "Blessed are your eyes," etc.), the death of Moses, and a description of his greatness (10-12): "There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses . . . in all the *signs and the wonders* . . . in all that *mighty hand* in all the fear. . . ." Cf. with this the description of the impression made by our Lord on the people at Nazareth (xiii. 54-58): "They were astonished at His *mighty works*," "a *prophet* is not without honour." One of the prophetic lessons for the Feast of Tabernacles (Zech. xiv.) gives an eschatological picture of the triumph of the Kingdom of God over the enemies, and some of the parables of the Kingdom envisage a future state of things, the mixture of good and evil in the kingdom (cf. the parable of the wheat and the tares).

In the editorial conclusion (Matt. xiii. 34, 35), the quotation from Psalm lxxviii. 2, introduced with Matthew's characteristic formula, is peculiar to Matthew. This psalm, *one of the psalms appointed for the Feast of Tabernacles*, gives a poetic picture of Israel's past history from the time of the Exodus to David's enthronement, and the concentration of worship on Zion, in



contrast to Deuteronomy xxxii. (the "Song of Moses") and xxxiii. (the "Blessing of Moses"), which are represented as pictures of *future* development. The Psalmist uses didactically (*cf.* Deut. vi. 16, viii. 1-18) the Exodus and desert experiences of Israel as "parables" (Mashal) for his contemporaries, and interprets the "riddles"—*i.e.*, short enigmatic sayings which required explanation ("things hidden"). The historic facts described by the Psalmist are well known, but they become "parables" and "riddles" when applied to contemporary events, which the Psalmist only suggests (*cf.* verse 1). The Evangelist finds in Jesus' method of teaching in parables an analogy to that of the Psalmist's. "Things hidden from the foundation of the world" suggests "the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven" (verse 11), which were always there, but hidden (*cf.* verse 17).

After describing in xii. 38 to xiii. 52 the attitude of the people to Jesus in contrast to that of the disciples, and the consequent critical attitude of our Lord towards the people, Matthew now (verses 54-59) turns to Mark in order to describe the impression which Jesus made, first upon the inhabitants of Nazareth, and then upon the Tetrarch (xiv. 1-2). This section, although not chronologically a continuation of verse 53, might have been suggested, as we have already pointed out, by the Deuteronomic lesson for the last day of Tabernacles (Deut. xxxiv. 10-12). It is a difficult problem to decide where it really belongs chronologically, for Mark puts it (Mark vi. 1-5) after the healing of Jairus' daughter, while Luke brings it (Luke iv. 16, 23) at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, but it is probable that Matthew places it here in order to preserve the connexion with the Deuteronomic background.

Although it is not the aim of the present writer to discuss the question of chronology, yet this seems an opportune place for suggesting the following. If the liturgical factor is kept in mind, it might have been expected that the events recorded in Matthew xiv. had taken place in the late autumn. But verse 19 dispels this idea, for "they sat on the *grass*" (the word implies "green grass," *cf.* Mark). So it must have been springtime. According to this, our Lord's activities are, then, not recorded from when "He departed thence," which was the period of the Feast of Tabernacles—*i.e.*, autumn. We suggest that between Matthew xiii. 53 and 54 the intervening six months were spent in Judea. That would mean that, from the beginning of our Lord's ministry to the feeding of the 5,000, about one and a half years had elapsed. In Matthew xvi. 1-4 we find a repetition of the Pharisees asking for a sign. We suggest this to be a real repetition of the occurrence, not a



doublet; which brings the ministry up to yet another *New Year*, of which six months were spent in Galilee. This is confirmed by the Transfiguration narrative (Matt. xvii.), which has all the *motifs* of the Feast of Tabernacles. From here the narrative marches on towards the tragedy of the Last Passover, making the ministry of our Lord to be of about two and a half years' duration, which approximates the traditional chronology.

Finally, a word on Matthew xvi. 13-20 (Peter's confession). If, as we have suggested, the asking for a sign took place in the New Year and Day of Atonement season, that is to say, in the beginning of September, then the Cæsarea Philippi section falls into line chronologically with much aptitude, for this section bears clearly a connexion with the lessons and ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles, which occurred about ten days later. One of the lessons was Exodus xxxiii. to xxxiv., God speaking to Moses face to face (xxxiii. 11); Moses reminding God of His promise to *make Himself known to him* by name (*ibid.* 12); Moses asking God to show him His ways that he "*may know him*" (verse 13); to show him *His glory* (verse 18); Moses standing upon a *rock* when God revealed Himself to him (verses 21-23); God making a covenant with Moses on the *Mount*, revealing His attributes of mercy, *long-suffering, forgiveness, and holiness* (xxxiv. 1-10); which (*ibid.*, 27-35) follows with the description of Moses' *shining countenance* (cf. Transfiguration narrative, Matt. xvii., following the Cæsarea Philippi section). One of the psalms for the Feast of Tabernacles was Psalm lxxvi., and verse 1, "In Juda God is known," probably formed one of the *motifs* for our Lord's question about His Person. (For the liturgical connexion of this psalm with the ritual of Feast of Tabernacles cf. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, p. 67 f.)

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.



## MISCELLANEA

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE S.P.C.K. have published an exceedingly useful little pamphlet by Dr. Lowther Clarke entitled *The New Prayer Book Explained*. The history of Revision is briefly traced from 1549 to our own day, and the various permissive alterations in the Composite Book are explained. This thirty-page pamphlet, in clear type, costs only 3d., and gives just the information needed: no Church bookstall should be without it.

We have also received from the S.P.C.K. a series of pamphlets (thirty pages, price 3d. net) entitled *Plain Guides to Lay Work*, dealing with the work of Sunday School teachers, churchwardens, organists, etc. They are written by authors well qualified to advise on such matters, and their close attention to detail will make them welcome aids to the many-sided ministry of the laity.

### CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

I have read with great interest the note in your February number on "the Fourth Gospel as a Document of the Early Palestinian Church" with its discussion on St. John's attitude to topography and chronology respectively. The suggestion that the custom of pilgrimage was already making itself felt when the Gospel was written is interesting, but it seems to me that the phenomenon is a particular instance of a general principle. In such mystical writers as I have studied there appears to be a tendency to emphasize God's transcendence over time and in consequence—such are the limitations of the human mind which cannot look at both space and time from the outside simultaneously—to think and express themselves largely in spatial categories.

I am at present separated from all my books, and even if I were not it would take more time than I can spare to find the references. St. John himself begins his prologue outside time, but says the Logos *ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, an ellipsis that well suggests the eternal relationship of the Son to the Father. It is he who records the saying "before Abraham was I AM." In the Apocalypse the influence of spatial or topographical ideas is again noticeable. Many of the visions are much clearer if we suppose the seer to be standing in imagination at Jerusalem with the Dead Sea on one hand and the Mediterranean on the other, a point that is well developed in the ever-fascinating fragments of Archbishop Benson's intended commentary. We remember the angel with a measuring-rod and the plan of the Eternal City. The transcendence over time is completely summed up in the description of the Lamb as "slain from the foundation of the world," or, again, in the prologue where grace is *ἀπὸ ὁ ὦν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*. I suppose it would be hardly logical to claim



both that we have here an indication that one author wrote Gospel and Revelation and that the point of similarity in the treatment of space and time is common to all mystics.

If a layman trained in geology, not in theology, may venture to make a suggestion, would it not be well if God's transcendence over time were more often taught? We all learnt His transcendence over space at our mother's knees; we were told that God is present everywhere, and the idea thus crudely put grows up as an integral part of our mind. Perhaps it is because there is no such word that we are never taught that God is present *everywhen*; that God is unconditioned by time is not part of our mental outfit, and we are consequently puzzled as to how Christ died for our individual sins unless we are bound to commit them.

In the Holy Sacrifice we are caught up not only out of space into Heaven, but also out of time into Eternity, and can quite logically pray, in the words of the Roman Canon, to be delivered "from all evil, past, present, and to come." The relativity of space and time is new science but old theology, though one side of it is rather neglected.

Yours etc.,  
C. N. BROMEHEAD.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,  
PARLIAMENT STREET, YORK.

### NOTES ON PERIODICALS

*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.* 1926. Heft 3/4.

The place of honour is given to a very long and careful study by K. Budde of Deuteronomy and Josiah's Reformation. He argues against the modern view that Deuteronomy is exilic or post-exilic, dependent on Jeremiah, as also against Welch's theory that it is several centuries earlier than Josiah. The difficulties felt by some scholars are due to their failure to recognize that Deuteronomy is a programme rather than a code. It is put on Moses' lips and therefore must in some ways be inconsistent with the situation described in 2 Kings xxii., which however presupposes a knowledge of Deut. on the part of readers. The core of Deut. is the product of the prophetic movement in the time following Hosea and it assumed its fuller form shortly before its discovery as described in Kings. There was no element of deception. The account given in Kings was a bald summary for those who knew the main facts. If we had full information our scruples would disappear. We have no scruple in making figures of the past speak our sentiments in poetry: the Hebrews extended this literary device to history, as they conceived it.

W. F. Albright discusses "The Topography of the Tribe of Issachar" in the light of recent archæological research. W. Staerk sees in "the Servant of Yahweh" of Isa. xl.-lv. a historical character of the Exile, who has been identified with the nation in xlix. 3 "thou art my servant—Israel. . . ." The actual facts are for ever hidden from us. In compensation for the loss we have the immeasurable gain that Isa. liii. has been transferred to a realm above history and interpreted in the light of the Cross. A. Marmorstein studies Isa. liii. The margin of R.V. is right



in v. 3: "He hid as it were his face from us." This is explained by Lev. xiii. 45, where the leper covers his upper lip. The Servant is considered to be *as* a leper.

P. Humbert cleverly analyses Nahum i, which he takes to be a hymn (2-8), followed by a question put by the priest (9a), and the congregation's answer (9b, 10); then by two oracles, and in 15 by a chant of victory. The whole may be ascribed to the autumn of 612, probably the feast of the New Year (according to Mowinckel observed as the enthronement feast of Yahweh, and of the King, identified with the national God), when news of the Fall of Nineveh had reached Jerusalem.

Many interesting facts and views are collected in the Editor's summary. We note especially the recent archaeological evidence that in the patriarchal time the Canaanites occupied the Jordan valley and the coastal plain, so that the central hills were free to wandering shepherds. A new Hittite text from Boghazkoi tells us that "Anittas in his time put the resettling of Hattusas under a ban," an exact parallel to Jos. vi. 26.

The 45th "Beiheft" is exceptionally interesting, being a study by M. Lurje, a Moscow professor, of the economic and social condition of Palestine under the kings. With great thoroughness it collects all the data and interprets them from the Communist standpoint. The land was originally held in common, but in the frequent wars the big proprietors became predominant, because they were responsible for raising troops. The proportions of the population represented by big landlords, rich peasants, landless proletariat and slaves are estimated. Probably the attempt to find an original Communism in Israel will be as unsuccessful as it has proved elsewhere. The key to the social conditions of Israel is surely that the Hebrews were a military aristocracy which gradually coalesced with the people of the land, but retained a supremacy which was eventually translated into economic terms. But Lurje makes many good points. David was obviously backed by the landless proletariat (1 Sam. xxii. 2, xxv. 10). Solomon made foreign trade a State monopoly, as Soviet Russia does to-day. The import of luxuries in his reign upset the balance of trade, which had to be rectified by the cession of 20 cities to Hiram towards the end of Solomon's reign (1 Kings ix. 11). The prophets, except Amos, who was expelled by the Government as a dangerous agitator, were no democrats in the modern sense. They accepted kingship as the normal form of the State. Their social programme was that the powerful should do right and not oppress the lower classes, not that the proletariat should come to its own. If the attempt to re-write Biblical history in terms of modern Russian theory breaks down, few recent monographs on the Old Testament rival this in interest. Progress can be made in two ways, by the accumulation of fresh facts and by the study of familiar facts with new eyes. Everything must look different to a Moscow professor who has lived through such an epoch of history as the Russian Revolution.

W. K. L. C.

---

*Zeitschrift für die N.T. Wissenschaft.*

The first number for 1926 is full of good things. The most important article is E. Schwartz' study of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Symbols produced at Chalcedon. Creeds promulgated by Councils



became part of the legal documents of the Empire; they were "protocolled" in the same sense as the Acta of the Senate. Hort's theory, that C (Constantinopolitanum) was only a Confession put forward by Cyril of Jerusalem to prove his orthodoxy, which, approved by the Council, in course of time was accepted as its Creed, is impossible, as cautious English scholars have generally held. Schwartz quotes A. E. Burn (*The Council of Nicæa*, p. 98, 1925): "We must wait for Schwartz' edition of the Greek MSS. of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon before we can restore with certainty the text of N or C." He proceeds: "Since some time may elapse before (my edition) appears in print, I have decided to publish the whole of the Greek and Latin material of those Acta for N. and C." The exact reconstruction of the text of N and C as they were incorporated in the Chalcedonian definitions is difficult, if not impossible. The text presupposed by the Latin *versio antiqua* is better than that of the Greek MSS. Perhaps some dogmatic theologian will soon explain to our readers the bearing of this important article on the views generally held about the Creeds.

Th. Hermann has a lengthy article on "The School of Nisibis." J. Jeremias writes on Our Lord's life of prayer, in a more popular fashion than is usual in this periodical. Other contributions come from the pen of E. Riegenbach on the Oxyrhyncus fragment giving the words of Jesus to the high priest; from H. Koch and von Harnack on the Muratorian fragment; and from W. Michaelis on Cenchreæ (Rom. xvi. 11), which, it is suggested, was a suburb of Ephesus, on the banks of the brook Cenchrios—the Epistle to the Romans will then have been written from Ephesus.

R. Eisler concludes his article on the Lord's Supper, the first instalment of which was fully reviewed in THEOLOGY, Feb., 1926. The article abounds in brilliant combinations and guesses and is indispensable to scholars who study the Jewish antecedents of the Eucharist. The Didache preserves an early stage of development, at which the Christians repeat the ancient Jewish family ritual of breaking a loaf and sharing it and drinking from a common cup. The words spoken are the ancient Jewish words of blessing, which Jesus had used; but they are altered so that the Christians thank God no longer for the gift of the earthly vine, but for the revelation of the heavenly vine of David. Prefixed to the article is a short study by the editor, Prof. Lietzmann, in which he dismisses one of Eisler's main ideas, that *ὁ ἀφικόμενος* is a Messianic term, as "a figment of fancy." The Jewish *afiqomen* merely means "desert." In the Mishnah passage relied on by Eisler the sense is: You must not dismiss the participants in the passover feast ἐπὶ κῶμον, i.e., to go on to another feast ("to make a night of it," as we say in English). In the light of this destructive criticism by a famous scholar, Eisler's theories should be valued rather for the wide learning and brilliant illustrations that accompany them than for their positive conclusions.

W. K. L. C.

---

The industry of Mgr. Batiffol is extraordinary. He has lately contributed to two Reviews studies as learned as they are interesting, each of which must have involved very wide research. The first appeared in the *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana*, 1925, and is devoted to tracing



the history of the titles *Papa*, *Sedes Apostolica*, and *Apostolatus* as designations peculiar to the Bishop of Rome and the Roman See. He concludes that *Apostolatus* is the most recent of these formulæ, appearing as it does for the first time in 417, and representing the usage of the Court of Ravenna; that *Sedes Apostolica* is a formula of earlier date than *Cathedra Petri* or *Sedes Petri*, for it first appears in the time of Pope Damasus 366-†84, and then becomes the local Roman phrase; while *Papa*, as a title exclusively appropriated to the Roman bishop, begins with the Council of Toledo in A.D. 400. It does not, of course, follow that these titles were then new, in the sense attached to them. They may have been in use before the date of the first record of their appearance. But it is interesting to observe that, during the fifth century, they gained no acceptance in the East. *Apostolatus* does not occur in the writings of Eastern bishops. *Sedes Apostolica* was used at the Council of Ephesus, but objection was taken to it. And *Papa* did not find acceptance.

A longer, not less candid, and very learned article was contributed by Mgr. Batiffol to *Récherches de la Science religieuse* (1926), t. xvi., pp. 193-264) on "L'empereur Justinien et le Siège apostolique." It is an enquiry "de savoir ce qu' était pour Justinien le Siège apostolique? Comment accorder les égards qu'il professait pour le pape de Rome avec les violences dont il usa, et comment accorder la devotion au Siège apostolique avec le césaropapisme?" And the answer, after a searching and entertaining history, amply supported throughout by apposite use of the originals, is: "En ce qui concerne ce dernier [sc., le Siège apostolique], Justinien sentait le besoin de l'avoir pour lui, il ne pouvait pas se passer de lui: il a mis tout en œuvre pour s'assurer de sa collaboration, même la violence, même la corruption. Le jour où il s'est trouvé en présence d'un Vigile refusant de condamner les Trois Chapitres, Justinien a refusé de s'incliner devant le pape, mais il a déclaré rester en communion avec le Siège apostolique et tenir le pape pour rien." Both articles are illuminating, and, besides, excellent examples of Mgr. Batiffol's skill and humour.

B. J. KIDD.

*The Journal of Religion.* (University of Chicago Press.)

If the last number of volume vi. contains nothing of interest to British readers, No. 1 of volume vii. is both valuable and interesting. In the first place, there is a sympathetic study of Jansenism by Mr. W. K. Ferguson. Jansenism, he thinks, was the revival, in a particularly acute form, of the perennial struggle of the few austere and deeply religious souls whose standards of theology and of morality are absolute and who cannot compromise with inertia and lower spiritual levels. It did succeed in establishing a higher standard of morality, but it also prepared the way for the deism and scepticism of the eighteenth century. The quarrel of Jansenism with Jesuitry is treated with insight. The article, which concludes with four hitherto unpublished letters of Arnauld d'Andilly and his sister, is an important one. It is followed by a paper on the "Indian Appreciation of Jesus." This follows the line of that suggestive book, *The Christ of the Indian Road*. Thirdly, Professor Bundy analyzes the incident of Our Lord's baptism. He concludes that all three of the Synoptists regard it "as the time and place of Jesus' call to a public



career; in Matthew and Luke, to a Messianic career; in Mark, to the career of a called and commissioned prophet who is endowed and equipped with the Divine Spirit." It was, as St. Luke records, a sacred religious rite during which Jesus Himself was praying. But it played, as far as we know, no important part in the life of Our Lord, though His participation in the rite was neither perfunctory nor superficial, "for such are the very things in religion that Jesus condemned most severely." Finally, a note by the chaplain of a mental hospital on the effect of a disturbance element in religion makes interesting reading. May the rest of volume vii. follow the tradition of No. 1.

H. S. MARSHALL.

*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses.*

The January number has a thoughtful article on "The Trustworthiness of the Memories recorded in the Gospels," by L. Cerfaux. A. Janssen writes very gravely "On the Struggle Against the Venereal Peril." There is an important Note on "The Separation of Church and State," referring to recent publications, and in particular *Quellen zur Geschichte der Trennung von Staat und Kirche*, by Zaccaria Giacometti, of Zurich.

*Nouvelle Revue Théologique.*

The December number has a devotional article on the Mystical Christ, by E. Delaye, S.J., practical advice on chastity, and a meditation on the virtue of hope, by E. Messeh, S.J. The January number has a suggestive article on the "Catholic Doctrine of Almsgiving," by R. Brouillard, S.J. E. Messeh writes on "Proud Obedience."

The February number discusses natural desire and the vision of God, the essential reason of religious obedience, and the Eucharistic Heart. There is a noteworthy article on "The Indigenous Episcopate," by P. Charles, S.J., discussing the missionary history of China, and the extraordinary importance of the recent consecration by the Pope of six Chinese Bishops. The official report of the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908 is quoted to show the searchings of heart which troubled the Anglican Church on this question. That is ancient history for us who know of the great work of Bishop Azariah of Dornakal and the Japanese Bishop of S. Tokyo. We thank God for the blessing already vouchsafed to their labours.

*Irenikon.*

The December number begins with a summary of a recent book by Dr. Georg Boss, a contributor to *Una Sancta*, on the original sin of divisions of faith, which has attracted some notice in Germany. It enables Father de Wyels to draw his own moral about Protestantism and the undeserved accusations which Dr. Boss brings against the Catholic Church. But it is a good thing that the bitter cry of the author should have this further publicity. There is a short account of the religious ceremony of marriage in the Russian Church, and an account of a visit to the Phanar. Extracts are quoted from a speech of M. Kuhlman at a conference of students in Bulgaria. It is asserted under the heading



Chronicle that the "Synodal Church" in Russia is declining. In Petrograd the Patriarchal Church has received back from the Bolsheviks the Church of S. Alexander Nevski, on condition of restoring it, and a congregation of some 12,000 contributed in an hour 75,000 roubles.

Several articles from the *Church Times* are quoted criticizing the conference at Lausanne, and Dr. Mozley's article in *THEOLOGY* (December). Some excellent *Indices* complete the issue of this attractive magazine for its first year.

A. E. BURN.

*The International Review of Missions.*

This issue for January, 1927, contains a remarkable and clear summary by Mr. J. R. Mott of the elements now agitating the Eastern world—viz., anti-foreign agitation, anti-Capitalism, Sovietism, anti-militarism, revolution in letters, politics, religion, and means of communication, lowering of moral standards, the spirit of criticism; but there are several forces making for union, and he is strikingly hopeful of the near future. Conditions in Japan are described by the Rev. Dr. W. Axling; he thinks that the native Church will need outside help for some time yet. The problem of the indigenous Church, as it affects India, is discussed by the Rev. W. Paton, and he pleads for simple schemes of devolution, sympathy with native suggestions, very careful and thorough training of the ministry, and close individual personal relationships. The Rev. R. L. Pelly has an interesting paper on the contribution which Hinduism can make to Christianity; this lies in the recall of Christianity to some half-forgotten ideals such as peace, the sense of spiritual values, the long and narrow way, faith, contemplation, and the Divine immanence in nature; there is no real addition to be made. The Rev. Dr. J. S. Conning tells the story of the Jews in America and leads up to present-day conditions; the modern "Dispersion" provides an interesting parallel to that of Bible days; the Jew is still hated for his exclusiveness and commercial success (in spite of American professions of freedom and equality), but he is not the religious propagandist that he was in early days, and many of them encourage a sordid materialism and the lowering of moral standards; a few are attracted to other cults, and some are losing their hatred of Christianity. Other papers deal with the recent conference on African problems held at Le Zoute, with the difficulties of translating an African language, and with the existence of a moral sense among the Bantu.

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

NOTE

CONFESSION TO LAYMEN IN THE WESTERN CHURCH

Two articles appeared in *THEOLOGY* of February and March, 1925, on "Confession to Laymen," dealing with the Eastern custom of confessing to monks, who were considered to possess special gifts of the Holy Spirit, instead of to the official priesthood. Such monks were sometimes, but oftener not, in priests' orders. They inherited the prestige of the martyrs and confessors, were on the orthodox side in the Iconoclastic controversy,



and had the additional advantage of being celibates. The subject is worked out in two monographs, by Holl and Hörmann, which, though written one from the Protestant the other from the Roman Catholic standpoint, come to similar conclusions.

A most thorough and competent monograph on the same problem in the Western Church has now been published by Father Teetaert of Louvain University (*La Confession aux Laïques dans l'église Latine depuis le viii<sup>e</sup> jusqu'au xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Bruges, Beyaert; Paris, Gabalda), which in 500 pages gives all the information students are likely to want. Most candidly he acknowledges the extraordinary divergence of practice in different ages of the Church, and concludes that "the continuity and immutability of the dogma are preserved by the universal and perpetual admission of the principle that the reconciliation of the sinner with God is certain only through the Church." This formula might well be taken as an *eirenicon*. As we study his pages and note the skill and sympathy with which the Church met the varying needs of successive generations we shall be less than ever disposed to accept "the corrupt following of the apostles" as a possible description of the theoretical penitential system which confronted the Reformers. H. Lea in his *History of Auricular Confession* took the decrees of the fourth Lateran Council (1215) to be an imposing of the clerical yoke, and confession to laymen to be a survival of primitive practice. The facts do not support his position.

The Western and Eastern practices had different roots. In the West we must distinguish three stages: (a) public penance; (b) "tariffed penance," by which the Church imposed on the Germanic tribes a scale of penances corresponding to the *Wergeld* to which they were accustomed in secular life; (c) a third and final stage when absolution emerged as the main factor and satisfaction retired into the background. Detailed confession came in at the second stage, to enable penalties to be assigned. It is important to notice the part played by the monks. In their own community life they practised (a) the *culpa*, or accusation of themselves before the brethren, and (b) confession to the Superior, for the purposes of *direction*. In the early Middle Ages monks played an important part in the evangelization of the West. They naturally urged the people to practise the discipline to which they themselves were accustomed. This originated the custom of confession to laymen. Bede's teaching was widely influential, that sin was cured by the prayers of the faithful, who must therefore know the state of those for whom they prayed. But up to the 10th century the emphasis was all on penance, rather than on confession. As penalties became milder, stress was laid on the humiliation involved in confessing—*erubescencia* was the technical word. (No one ever held that any but a priest had the power of the keys.) So important was this held to be that in the absence of a priest it was thought not only desirable but necessary to confess to a layman. The twelfth-century Canonists urge that in such cases grave as well as venial sins should be confessed; a general practice was to confess venial sins to a layman, grave ones to a priest. They were much influenced by the teaching of St. Augustine, *De Vera et Falsa Penitentia*. The first scholastics taught that absolution was necessary as well as confession. St. Thomas was the first theologian to combine effectively the subjective element of contrition with the objective element of absolution. He no longer takes contrition as the main part of the ordinance and as conferring pardon, but teaches that the sacramental value comes from the priestly



minister. Taking this view, which prevailed in later centuries, he seems inconsistent in allowing and even commending confession to laymen in certain cases. But his position was quite logical. Confession to laymen was firmly entrenched in practice, and he had to deal sympathetically with it. The penitent who, a priest not being available, confessed to a layman was doing all in his power and proving his *desire* for a priest's ministrations. In common estimation Baptism and Penance were closely connected, being two Sacraments conferring remission of sins. Since the services of a layman were necessary in an emergency to obtain Baptism, so were they in the case of Penance.

In conclusion, three points may be mentioned.

1. The problem was universally recognized as pressing. Our forefathers took their sins very seriously and in this respect were an example to us.

2. The continual references to the absence of a priest, in an age when we generally think a large proportion of the population were in holy orders, are very remarkable. We can only conclude that war was looked on as the normal occupation of mankind.

3. Even a cursory study of the problem is of real devotional value. The modern priest confessing to the server in the *Præparatio* is the heir to a millennial tradition. From the days of St. James through the monks to the Middle Ages and then on to our own times runs the precious tradition of the part played by confession to the laity in deepening the contrition of the penitent.

W. K. L. C.

---



## REVIEW

### THE BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1926.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE CHRIST. By A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

The title of this book might lead some prospective reader to expect a neatly docketed analysis of the various types of Christology discoverable in the N.T., followed by a judicious interpretation of them "in terms of modern thought." And not knowing, perchance, his Dr. Rawlinson, he would probably choose some other book which promised greater excitement. If so, let him at once be dissuaded.

The main theme of the book is the consideration of that central and most vital question which perhaps may be stated thus: The divinity of Jesus, whence was it? from heaven or from men? His own by right, or a mere degree *honoris causa* conferred from without? It is mainly with continental champions of the latter view that Dr. Rawlinson does battle; but it may be of use to English readers not skilled in the German tongue if we cite here a typical passage from Foakes-Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, i., p. 415f, on the origin of the orthodox Christology.

"The most probable conclusion is that Jesus was known among his personal followers not as Maran ('Lord'), but as Rabbi ('Teacher'), and this custom prevailed in Galilee and in Jerusalem, and is reflected in Mark and Q. But in other Aramaic-speaking circles outside Jerusalem, possibly in Antioch or the neighbourhood, he came to be known as Maran. . . . This word was then translated by Κύριος, and so passed into Greek circles. In course of time the connotation of Κύριος in Greek religion became a dominant factor in thought, and Jesus was regarded as a Divine Κύριος, the Lord of a circle of initiates who worshipped him. Moreover, the influence of the Septuagint, which used Κύριος to render the tetragrammaton, no doubt assisted this development: many passages in which the O.T. speaks of Jehovah came to be treated as references to Jesus, and the divine attributes of the Lord Jehovah passed over to the Lord Jesus." Christianity, the same authors tell us, so far from being a "faith once delivered to the saints," is a complex of many elements; a synthesis between a movement within Judaism and the Græco-Oriental thought of the Roman Empire.

A contention of this kind cannot be met either by exegesis of the N.T. or by marshalling the opinions of the Fathers. It has to be dealt with by the rigidly scientific weapons of the "historico-critical method of study," and this necessity, while



limiting in one sense the scope of Dr. Rawlinson's work, lends to it none the less a special interest.

The eightfold division of the subject, so tiresomely inflicted upon Bampton Lecturers, is thus disposed by Dr. Rawlinson: I. The Jewish Religious Hope; II. The Christology of the Jewish-Christian Church; III. The Gentile-Christian Mission; IV., V, VI. The Contribution of St. Paul; VII. Mediator, High Priest, Living One; VIII. The Incarnation of the Word. He also calls in half a dozen "appended notes" to redress the balance of the chapters; and it must be owned that ch. vii. is little more than three short appended notes on the Pastorals, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, of which the first and third are decidedly jejune. The Petrine epistles, St. James, and St. Jude are not surveyed at all, and little is said of the Christology of the Synoptists; these omissions the lecturer candidly confesses.

The most serious challenge to traditional orthodoxy comes to-day, as in the passage quoted above, not from those who would drive a wedge between the Synoptists' "Jesus of history" and the dogmatic theology of St. Paul and St. John, but from the far more radical attempt to drive in the wedge between Jesus and Christianity, between the Life and the earliest record of the Life. The opening verse of St. Mark's Gospel as it stands in our Bible may contain a false reading—probably not—but it gives what Catholics and radicals alike would accept as a true description of the author's intention: "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Just because this is so, our earliest Gospel is not, we are now told, a simple history of Jesus recorded for its own sake, but an *apologia pro fide sua* issued by the first Greek-speaking Christians. And between their faith and the actual history and personality of its Object, there is a great gulf fixed.

This, then, is the main Christological problem of the present time, and we could hardly wish for better guidance than that which Dr. Rawlinson gives us in this book. His first chapter makes a point of cardinal importance in stressing the inseparable connection between the O.T. and Christianity: "what is really at stake is the validity of the Jewish monotheistic faith in the living God." It was in this soil that the Faith had its roots, and however much Greek influences may have been brought in to enrich the soil, there was no essential change in the plant.

But is the development from "Rabbi" to "Maran," from discipleship of Jesus as a teacher to dependence on Him as Lord, conceivable on that soil? Yes, replies Dr. Rawlinson in his second lecture; faith in Him as Messiah had clearly begun before His death; it was restored and vivified, but not created,



by the Resurrection. And "to recognize Jesus as the Messiah was already to depend upon Him as the predestined Mediator of the religious salvation of Israel. The relation of religious dependence had already in that moment begun." The new light which their faith shed upon the O.T. scriptures Dr. Rawlinson is disposed to ascribe, like St. Luke, to our Lord Himself. No other hypothesis, in fact, really explains the phenomena. There might have been a real peril of the deification of Jesus in a heathen sense in the Græco-Roman world, with its religious syncretism which Dr. Rawlinson sketches vividly in his third chapter,\* had not the Hebraic element in Christianity been guarded and emphasized. But it was guarded and emphasized; and precisely in this fact Dr. Rawlinson finds the great achievement of St. Paul.

Chapter iv., accordingly, is a vindication, which seems to us convincing, of the predominantly Jewish character of the Christianity which St. Paul believed and preached; the theory of Bousset notwithstanding. Developments in faith and practice were continuous with this; there was no conversion of Christianity into "something essentially other than itself." St. Paul's doctrine of Christ and of salvation form the main themes of the next two lectures; we may draw special attention to two sound pieces of exegesis on p. 131 and p. 155, where the claim that St. Paul identifies our Lord with the Spirit in 1 Cor. xv. 45 and 2 Cor. iii. 17 is shown to be groundless.† St. Paul's real thought is that "the risen Christ indwells His Church through the Spirit"; and his theology is essentially, if not explicitly, Trinitarian. There are some very valuable remarks on this theme—in a discussion of St. Paul's so-called "Christ-mysticism"—in the concluding pages of ch. vi.

Space is lacking to deal adequately with Dr. Rawlinson's treatment of the Fourth Gospel. Like Canon Streeter he has to open the door and bring in the son of Zebedee to succour, if only indirectly, the sadly overworked Presbyterian who at the moment is the critics' favourite author. Two other points we may note: (1) In his Logos doctrine the Evangelist uses terminology current at Ephesus in order to express the same type of Christology—a Hebraic "Wisdom" Christology—as had been developed by St. Paul and the writer to the Hebrews; (2) Dr. Rawlinson refutes the strange view of Bousset that the Fourth Gospel, so far from being Jewish in character, presents the Hellenistic conception of *deification by means of the vision of God*.

\* See also the very valuable Appended Note vi.

† Contrast *The Modern Churchman*, September, 1921, pp. 257 and 272. On p. 257 Dr. Barnes makes the centrality of Jesus "as Redeemer and Saviour" entirely dependent on this identification.



This very incomplete sketch of the Bampton Lectures for 1926 may have suggested that their object is mainly polemical. Such an impression would be entirely unjust to the author. He has given us a definitely constructive work of high value; and his "criticism of the critics" is but a by-product, though a very useful by-product, of his own determination to give the best explanation possible of the facts which have to be explained. Chief amongst these are "three elements which remained constant throughout . . . first, the religious cult of the Lord Jesus"; secondly, "the insistence on monotheism"; thirdly, "the affirmation that the Person of Jesus is of absolute and ultimate religious significance for mankind." How can the first two be reconciled with each other? "The solution," writes Dr. Rawlinson, "was not finally reached until it was affirmed at Nicea that the Son of God, in His essential being, is one with the Father—a solution which can only be repudiated at the cost of regarding Christianity as having involved from the beginning the idolatrous deification of a Jew."

ERIC GRAHAM.

## NOTICES

THE HYMN "TE DEUM" AND ITS AUTHOR. By A. E. Burn, D.D. Faith Press. 2s. 6d.

This book tells us everything about its subject which is required by anyone who is not a liturgical specialist. The Dean shows that recent evidence goes to confirm Dom Morin's ascription of the authorship of Te Deum to Niceta of Remesiana, a Doctor of the Church whom the Dean's own good offices are rescuing from oblivion. In these pages we have a vivid picture of him as theologian, poet, and missionary. The meaning of Te Deum itself is brought out not only by an analysis of its structure which will be new to most people, but also by a sketch of the devotional setting which surrounded it in the fourth century. The book sets one wondering rather anxiously whether the future of Te Deum in the English Church need be bound up with that of Morning Prayer. Might it not be used far more often as a separate act of praise on festivals? It might well take the place of some of those too frequent Sunday evening processions in which the denizens of the Chancel, like the militia of the Greek city-states (see Thucydides, *passim*), are continually setting out *πανδημεί*, and returning *ἀπρακτοί*.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

PAUL. A Study in Social and Religious History. By Adolph Deissmann. Second edition. Hodder and Stoughton. 2ls.

The present volume is a new edition of Professor Deissmann's well-known work on St. Paul, which has been out of print for several years. It has been thoroughly revised, and the treatment of one or two points



has been somewhat developed. We welcome the prospect of its wider circulation. Not only does the author bring to the subject his great knowledge of the Papyri, but his whole method of approach is refreshingly independent. Several of his positions have by this time become almost commonplaces, but the whole book is a valuable protest against an academic and jejune Liberalism. He recognizes that St. Paul is primarily "a hero of religion," not a theologian. The centre of his "cult-religion" is not a leader or teacher who was crucified, but a risen and present Saviour. If the author does not arrive at the full Catholic position, he is well on the road towards it. The great weakness of his treatment is his failure to realize that for St. Paul membership in the Christian fellowship is an essential part of Christianity, and that the Christian Church is first and foremost Israel as refounded by Jesus the Messiah. This failure leads him to an individualistic idea of mystical communion with Christ. He misses the truth that stands out in the Epistles, that "Christ-faith," and "Christ-joy," to use his own phrases, are all mediated by membership in the body of Christ, the new Israel. That at once lessens the danger of a false and subjective mysticism of which he is so conscious. So, too, because he has no real place for the distinctive work of the Holy Spirit, he crudely identifies the Spirit and the Ascended Christ, quoting two texts of dubious interpretation which might support this view, and ignoring the passages that are plainly inconsistent with it. The Jews expected both a Messiah and an outpouring of the Spirit of God, but they never confused the two ideas. St. Paul believed that both expectations had been fulfilled in the coming of Jesus and its results. The Christian Church enjoyed the fellowship of the Spirit, because Jesus the Messiah had endowed it with the power of His own Spirit-filled life, but it never identified Pentecost with the Parousia.

But we must not end on a note of criticism. The book abounds in stimulating suggestions. We may note as examples the need of attention to the Septuagint and its influence on primitive Christian statements, and the explanation why St. Paul did not go to Egypt. Our only regret is that such an interesting and valuable work was not published at a more reasonable price.

E. J. BICKNELL.

---

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. Part I, *The Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. III, The Text. Edited by J. H. Ropes. Macmillan. 30s.

The double text of the Acts has been explained in a brilliant but misleading way by Blass and others. Professor Ropes prefers to work with monumental patience, laying steady foundations which can never be destroyed. We open the book at random and find the following on pages 168, 169. On the left hand is printed Acts xvii. 24-31 in the text of B (Codex Vaticanus). Beneath it are the particulars in which the texts printed by Westcott-Hort and von Soden, and the text preferred by the editor, differ from B. Next follow the important variants in the Old Uncial text—Westcott-Hort's "neutral" text, here called by a name which does not beg the question. Under them we have the variants of the Antiochian text, WH's "Syrian" text. Finally there are some notes by the Editor. Facing all this, on p. 169, is printed the Greek text of Codex Bezae, D, with obvious slips corrected. Under this are the original slips which have been corrected. Next comes the Latin version



of Codex Bezae, known as *d*; then the evidence of the Latin Fathers, in this case a sentence from Tertullian and a version of the entire passage from Irenaeus; finally significant readings from the Harclean Syriac.

It will be noted that Dr Ropes provides not a critical text of the Acts, but materials for one. We therefore turn to the long Introduction to discover the principles upon which he has worked and the conclusions which he draws.

The first 200 pages are devoted to a full and very interesting description of the chief MSS. and versions. Then comes a section of great importance on the history of the Greek text of the Acts. There was an original phase of free variation and rewriting, to which both the Western text and the B text go back. The Western text was prepared early in the second century, perhaps at Antioch, for Church use, in connexion with the formation of a primitive canon. It is therefore a historical source for second-century Church history. D is a very corrupt form of this text. Indeed in later times nearly all texts were mixed, the Textus Receptus or Antiochian being pre-eminent in this respect. The great importance of B is that it, more than any other MS., is free from alien influences.

The purpose of the Western Reviser was "literary improvement and elaboration in accordance with his own taste, which was somewhat different from that of the author. . . . His text is nearly one-tenth longer than that of the Old Uncials." It includes two elements: "an ancient base, which would be of the greatest possible value if it could be recovered, and the paraphrastic rewriting of a second-century Christian." "The Western text was made before, and perhaps long before the year 150, by a Greek-speaking Christian who knew something of Hebrew, in the East, perhaps in Syria or Palestine." No other text than the Western made its way into Latin-speaking lands before the fourth, or into Syriac-speaking before the fifth, century.

We have no space in which to speak further of the value of this great book. Primarily it appeals to specialists, but it abounds in interesting matter not beyond the capacity of the ordinary New Testament scholar to enjoy. The two contrasting texts on opposite pages are a fascinating field in which to dig for treasure. Here are, in substance, two versions of the Acts which appealed to different Christians in the second century. Can we reconstruct the mental attitude that prompted the rewriting, which involved a ten per cent. addition, of the existing text of Acts? If so we have found a key to unlock many problems. Many workers can help in this task with the aid of Dr Ropes' two texts. In thanking the editor for his splendid help towards the recovery of the true text of Acts we must not forget the public spirit shown by Messrs. Macmillan in undertaking a book which must be highly unremunerative.

In conclusion we quote from the note on p. ccxcix an interesting discovery unknown to scholars as a whole, although von Soden's edition with its apparatus, containing the reading, has been published many years. In two minuscules—1852 and 2138—the reading in 1 John v. 18 is *ὁ γέννησις* instead of *ὁ γεννηθεὶς*. "Every one that is born of God sinneth not, but his birth from God preserves him." This is the Vulgate reading and, since it makes sense of an otherwise strange passage, and is now confirmed by Greek witnesses, is probably authentic.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.



## RELIGION IN GERMANY

UNA SANCTA. Ein Ruf an die Christenheit. Stuttgart: Frommann's Verlag. 10 gm. yearly.

LA RÉLIGION DANS L'ALLEMAGNE D'AUJOURD'HUI. By Raoul Patry. Paris: Payot. 20 fr.

Among the many changes that German religious thought is now undergoing, it is useful to have an impartial and thorough account, and such is the book of M. Patry. It is the result of two years' study on the spot, of two years' enquiry into the effects of disestablishment, according to the law of 1919. Where are Catholicism and Protestantism sympathetic, where antagonistic, and in what forms are they now developing? The conclusion of M. Patry is that they are extraordinarily little changed. The new boundaries of the Reich contained in 1919 just under sixty million inhabitants. Of these in every thousand the proportion was: Protestants, 652; Catholics, 330; Jews, 9; other denominations, 8. After the Revolution, and especially in the currency crisis, Lutheranism seemed very weak, but it has recovered. What it has lost is a conventional supremacy and the prestige of having the Kaiser as *Summus episcopus*, though he still claims the title. It has also undergone the influence of some extremely modernist pastors, one of which, Heydorn of Hamburg, actually wrote a pamphlet entitled "Out with the Church," and Fliedner-Planitz has openly preached communism. But the peculiar characteristic of contemporary Lutheranism is its sense of mystery, as shown in the work of Otto and of Heiler, who keeps a reverence for the Catholic spirit and tradition after his break with Rome. It is to the more orthodox side of this movement that Professor von Martin's quarterly *Una Sancta* addresses itself, and it is, in fact, an attempt to unite those who love the sacramental and traditional life of Christianity against the menace of modernism, as also against the taste for Oriental mysticism, which Steiner, Keyserling, and Spengler have cultivated in their different ways. In this connection it has induced Franciscan fathers to contribute articles for its special number of St. Francis of Assisi, and it includes Dr. Leighton Pullan, of Oxford, in the list of its regular collaborators. Will this movement take more a Lutheran or more a Catholic form? The influence of Harnack, and the tradition founded by Troeltsch suggest that it will turn from the rather arid terrain of Lutheranism to the varied scenery of Catholic life where rivers of living water flow from the stainless fountains.

But M. Patry does not show in German Catholicism any suddenness of movement or of fervour. The changes that have come to it have come as elsewhere in the application of the Thomistic philosophy to the questions of modern life and thought, and in the organization of the Centre party as a political force working on the old principle of the guilds that the politics of industry demand a social expression. Besides this, which is indeed suggestive and which escaped the attention of Mr. Gooch in his otherwise excellent book on Germany, the German Catholics have turned with a special interest to Rome as the centre of a moral force in the politics of the world, and as a support of the abstract idea of right in the economies and accommodations of states. Baron von Kramer-Klett has been the leader in this movement.

M. Patry has good chapters on the question of religious education, on the Jews, and on the various movements, some religious, some not, which



have interested the adolescent generation. He points also to a bizarre phenomenon, the attempt to replace the Old Testament by German mythology, an attempt which would mean undermining Christianity. But excellent as his book is, he is insufficiently precise in his account of the growth of modernism in Germany, of the movement which places human instinct and traditions above that supernatural life which is grace and that supernatural truth which is revelation. The movement is not peculiar to Germany, but it is as strong there as anywhere, and between it and orthodoxy there can be no compromise. It is just that point which is so clear to Professor von Martin; and one might almost say that the problem of the future in Germany is summed up in all that is implied by *Una Sancta*. Can those who believe that above human excellences there is another order, untainted, indefectible, reaching out to humanity and raising it to a life it could not otherwise attain—can they unite to learn and preach the love of Christ which passes knowledge? Can holiness unite them? If not, the disruptive energies of modernism will be indeed persuasive in their enthusiastic offer of a less supernal standard.

R. E. GORDON GEORGE.

ST. FRANCIS AND THE GREYFRIARS. By E. Hermitage Day, D.D., F.S.A. Mowbray. 5s. 6d.

Dr. Day's book, bound in cloth of the colour of the early Franciscan habit of undyed wool, from which the name Greyfriar was derived, is made up of five chapters originally read as lectures in Hereford Cathedral during the Lent of 1926, in preparation for the seventh centenary of the death of St. Francis of Assisi. It also contains an excellent, if short, bibliography, and a pleasant Preface by Fr. Waggett, who points out that "the literature of St. Francis is so immense, and often so difficult to follow, that we all owe a great debt to Dr. Day for having studied it so reverently and digested it for us so skilfully." Dr. Day's five chapters deal with the Forerunners of St. Francis; the Saint's Life and Times; his Spirit and Message; his Early Followers; and the Coming of the Greyfriars to England—the last a subject previously treated in graphic and telling fashion by the late Dr. Jessopp in *The Coming of the Friars*, a book with which this generation of readers is not as well acquainted as it should be. Dr. Day, however, deals more in historical detail than Dr. Jessopp, relying mainly on Thomas of Eccleston, who wrote his chronicle while memories of the Coming were still fresh. The beginnings of the order in England were humble enough—yet in sixteen years it was definitely organized and had seven Custodies; at London, Oxford, Bristol, Cambridge, Worcester, York, and Newcastle. There are facts in Dr. Day's book which are not dealt with in Dr. Jessopp's—thus, Dr. Day lays stress on the fact that the Franciscans were resolute in their refusal of endowments, and in their dependence upon work and voluntary alms: if they departed, he says, from the first precept that they should not handle money, they did not depart very far. We are all familiar with the baseless charges brought against the Friars as regards greed, love of money, and so on, but the fact remains that at the Dissolution of 1536 their real property was comparatively unimportant. Whatever the status of the Order at the time of the Suppression, no one can deny its one-time great services, not only to the poor but to learning. "The intellectual service of the Order to the Church was all the more valuable because it



was rendered at the moment when there was great need of it," says Dr. Day. "Not only at Oxford, but in the lesser houses it was as a new impulse." He instances the work of Grossetête, "the foremost scholar of his age," at Oxford, where he lectured for ten years before his consecration to Lincoln, and claims that the Oxford Franciscans "quickened learning throughout the West of Europe." This chapter is the best in Dr. Day's book, and a real contribution to Franciscan history.

J. S. FLETCHER.

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL. By S. A. Warner. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Warner's books upon Canterbury and Oxford Cathedrals were excellent examples of the scholarly handbook which is also lively and readable. His account of St. Paul's, uniform with those volumes, maintains their standard of attention to accuracy of detail and of care for the requirements of the intelligent reader who needs instruction of a not too technical kind. The author's interest in his undertaking is obvious: he writes easily and lightly, with a proper sense of the living interest of his facts, and of the personal characteristics of Wren and the other artists who contributed to the beautifying of the great church. Although he does not repress himself with the severe impersonality of the conventional compiler of guide-books, he has the virtue of recording his impressions without dogmatism. The book is, in short, a very competent description of the building and its history by a genial and careful observer, under whose guidance we may place ourselves with confidence. Its attractions are increased by the admirable illustrations, chiefly from photographs, which display the artistic treasures of the cathedral very successfully and, in many instances, from entirely novel points of view. Such a picture as that of the space between the inner dome and the brick cone will explain much to the reader who finds some difficulty in examining architectural drawings of sections with an untrained eye. Mr. Warner's historical notes are written with simplicity and clearness, and he provides a useful bibliography, in which the chief authorities for the constitutional history of the cathedral have their place. It is a difficult task to make the constitution of the chapter of St. Paul's intelligible to the ordinary person; but some connected account of it would have added value to the book and made the purposes and use of the building somewhat clearer. For those who prefer to visit St. Paul's with a less complete manual, a brief guide to the chief objects of interest, which can be detached and used separately, forms a supplement to the volume.

A. HAMILTON THOMPSON.

HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND. By A. D. Greenwood. Vol. III. A.D. 1689 to 1834. With Illustrations and Maps. Sheldon Press. 7s. 6d.

It is giving Miss Greenwood no slight praise to say that this, the third volume of her history, is well up to the high standard of her two preceding volumes. The idea of this particular work, we believe, was that it should be for the use of the upper classes in schools, and we have no hesitation in saying that the intention has been admirably and conscientiously fulfilled; there is, indeed, no better school history on the market, and as far as we are aware there is no other history, school or otherwise, in which full justice to the ecclesiastical side of English history is done; in



this respect it forms a much-needed antidote to the vastly over-rated Green and the unveracious Froude. An excellent feature is the Guide to Books given in the introductory note, though in this occurs one of Miss Greenwood's very few mistakes—Epworth, the home of the Wesleys, is not in Yorkshire, but in Lincolnshire. The history itself is divided into two periods; first, the "tolerably homogeneous eighteenth century, reckoning from our constitutional revolution of 1688-9 to the entry of England into the French Revolution war in 1793"; second, "the epoch of that war 1793-1815, and of its effects upon our country, a physical and moral storm-belt, culminating in another parliamentary reform, which almost exactly filled the brief reign of William IV." These periods have, of course, been dealt with of late years by a good many historians, but this is a history of the *people* of England, and Miss Greenwood has been wise in telling us more about social and political life than is usually told. She has an excellent chapter, for example, on Agrarian and Industrial Changes, in which she shows the iniquity of those Enclosure Acts, the passing of which gave rise to the popular sarcasm:

The Law pursues the man or woman  
Who steals a goose from off the common,  
But lets the greater felon loose  
Who steals the common from the goose.

She does full justice to the deplorable condition of the agricultural labourer, robbed of his common rights, and to the cruelties practised under the new factory system on the unfortunate children who, at an age when most children are scarcely out of the cradle, were kept at work in noisome surroundings for twelve and fourteen hours at a stretch. Before this Daniel Defoe had once boasted that in England every child of four years old could earn its own bread. But how many of their children survived? There are those amongst us to-day who tell us that we have made no progress during the last hundred years—it is a pity that they do not read the industrial history of a hundred years ago. Summed up, Miss Greenwood's present volume is a record of steady progress in social and political affairs, the story of a people steadily progressing to betterment and liberty. Her succeeding volume will deal with the similar developments of the Victorian Age.

J. S. FLETCHER.

THE CHURCH AND SCHOOL HYMNAL. Published jointly by S.P.C.K., Seeley, Service, and Co., and the C.E.S.S.I. 3s. 6d.

The appearance of this new hymn book is important in many ways.

Theologically it is important, because it is a striking and welcome token that a new era of appreciative understanding and theological approximation between the various schools of thought in the Church of England has at last dawned. Here we have a hymnal, jointly compiled by the S.P.C.K. and the Church of England Sunday School Institute, in co-operation with the proprietors of *The Children's Hymn Book*, which definitely accepts the principle that the various theological schools within the Anglican communion are—at least, in their saner representatives—not antagonistic but complementary; and that accordingly it is possible to produce a book of sacred song which all can use, though, of course, as is only natural, the selection made will vary widely in different cases.

In this comprehensive and reconciling compilation Evangelicals will



find their favourite hymns, those, for example, of Frances Havergal and Toplady, and even some from Moody and Sankey's collection, which last ought probably to have been excluded as below the general standard of the book. Liberals will welcome the inclusion of hymns by Phillips Brooks, Ainger, and even Stopford Brooke (these last, however, are doctrinally innocuous).

Those who sympathize with Labour and the ideals of the I.C.F. will be pleased to see included Elliott's "When wilt Thou save the people?"

Anglo-Catholics, on the whole, are well catered for. Twenty years—even ten years—ago it would have been impossible to include in any collection of hymns intended for general use such lines as "Lo, I sign the sign of Jesus meekly on my breast" (Hymn 257), or "I worship Thee, Lord Jesus, who in Thy love divine art hiding here Thy Godhead 'neath sign of bread and wine" (98), or "Now the priest upon the altar doth present the bread and wine to become in wondrous manner for our souls the food divine" (103). Catholics will also welcome the compilers' recognition of the fact that children—even young children—are now expected in many parishes to attend the Eucharist regularly, and even to be communicants. The selection of Eucharistic hymns is suitable and adequate. The chief weakness of the book from the Catholic standpoint is its poverty of hymns adequately expressing the warmth of Catholic devotion towards St. Mary, and its entire exclusion of hymns recognizing the Invocation of Saints. Surely the time is long past when the "Ora pro nobis" can fairly be considered an "extreme" form of devotion. Notwithstanding this, Catholic users of the book cannot but feel grateful to the compilers for the large number of definitely Catholic hymns which they have had the courage to include.

Among the other valuable features of the book we especially notice (1) that it attempts to educate the æsthetic taste of Church children by placing before them only what is artistically good; (2) that it adequately recognizes the new method in the Sunday School and Catechism; and (3) that it provides for the needs of the very young. The section "For Young Children" is admirably adapted to its purpose as to both words and music.

The reviewer would suggest that when a new edition is called for, a short supplement of mission hymns should be included. General missions for children, and special short missions for children and young people in preparation for Confirmation, are now becoming so general that it seems desirable to add a few hymns of a definitely "mission" character in order to make the collection complete.

The music of the hymnal, for compiling and arranging which Mr. C. Hylton Stewart is partly responsible, marks a great advance upon anything previously attempted in this direction. Mr. Hylton Stewart has obviously aimed at doing for the Sunday School and the Catechism what the English Hymnal is doing so well for adult congregations. His debt to this collection (from which a large number of tunes have been borrowed) is obvious in every section of the book. In a few cases he has succeeded in finding tunes which are an improvement on those given in the English Hymnal.

The new hymns—even those which are apparently written to order—reach for the most part a satisfactory standard both in music and words. Among new or unfamiliar tunes we would draw special attention to the noble melody to "O Jesus, I have promised," which replaces the sentimental and sugary tune in A. and M., and the somewhat better but not



really adequate one in E. H. Mr. Arthur Somervell contributes a vigorous setting in march rhythm to Mr. L. Housman's "Lord God of Hosts, within whose hand dominion rests on sea and land"; Mr. Hylton Stewart interprets adequately "England, arise"; Mr. Holst provides dignified music for "What heroes thou hast bred, O England!"; a delightful French traditional air is employed for Mr. Crum's hymn, "Let us thank the Christ." The musical setting to George Herbert's "Let all the world in every corner sing," by Mr. Martin Shaw, is considerably superior to the tune given in the English Hymnal.

The two gems of the section "For Young Children" are a very graceful and singable setting of Blake's "Little lamb, who made thee?" by Mr. Geoffrey Shaw, and a lilting melody by the late Canon Gardner to Mr. R. S. Ward's "Riding, riding, who is this riding?"

We notice with pleasure that Mr. Hubert Parry's setting to Blake's "Jerusalem" is included in the collection.

Congratulations are due to all concerned upon a thoroughly satisfactory achievement.

CHARLES HARRIS.